Appendix

Florida's Secretary of State Tom Adams Speaks on Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, all of us in the Congress are increasingly aware of the need for immediate action to halt the increased poisoning of our environment by all sorts of physical and chemical wastes.

Last year the 89th Congress made a significant beginning to halt this pollution and protect mankind's most precious resources, the air we breathe, the water we drink.

But Mr. Speaker, all our good intentions would be of little consequence without the tremendous interest in pollution control being shown across the country by State and local governments. We in Florida are particularly fortunate in having had a long record of constructive action against pollution, but much remains to be done.

Recently Florida's distinguished secretary of state and vice chairman of its board of conservation addressed himself to the need for more concerted action in pollution control. He expressed his great approval of the expanding scope of the Federal water pollution control program and the further proposed increases of Federal activity in this area.

One of the State's leading conservationists, interested in conserving and utilizing the State's resources in the most beneficial way, Tom Adams has been in the front of those in Florida calling for increased plans and action at the State level. He has formulated an imaginative program for giving a new sense of enthusiasm to Florida's efforts at pollution control. In order to enable the State to meet its full responsibilities under the present and planned Federal programs, he vigorously urges that all State agencies connected with water pollution and related problems be coordinated by the Florida cabinet.

Secretary Adam's thoughts concerning the problems of pollution are set forth in the following recent speech:

It is a privilege to share this occasion with you, especially since we also share a mutual concern over the invasion of pollution into our natural waterways.

Florida's waters always have been among our most outstanding assets, both from the standpoint of sheer beauty, and from the standpoint of economic value.

Back in our territorial days Governor William DuVal described our rivers and streams as being more valuable than mines of gold. Since that day, we have used them for commerce. We have used them for recreation. We have admired their natural, scenic beauty. We have drawn water from them for farms, homes, and factories, proving the abundant truth in the statements of DuVal more than 100 years ago.

We can never attain a level of development in excess of that which is capable of being sustained by our available and useable fresh water resource.

In the sleepy days of plantation culture—when only a handful of hardy pioneers had pushed as far into Florida as Sebastian Inlet—we not only found our rivers and streams to be beautiful and valuable, but we also found them to be convenient—convenient to carry away the wastes of city, home, and farm. In those days people were few and the rivers were adequate. Pollution was no problem. Nature was still able to overcome the carelessness of man.

The picture is quite different today. Six million people now live where only hundreds lived before. Thousands of acres of land have been cleared. More is being cleared each day. Evolving technology has brought with it industrial processes which demand more water, and which at the same time contaminate more water. Farmers till the soil to the river banks. Fertilizers and pesticides are washed out. Cities still find these watersways convenient dumping grounds for street drainage and sewage systems.

Consequently, pollution has reached such extremes that nature can no longer overcome it . . . or the pollutants are so complex that nature has no effect upon them.

As our population grows, as agriculture and industries grow, and as more and more demands are made upon our water supplies, this condition will continue to worsen. That is, of course, unless we can establish water quality standards, and have enough backbone to enforce them.

The time has come when we must realize that the demands for our water will continue to increase, but that our supplies of water will not. Every drop of water which you use in your homes and gardens—every drop that flows through our rivers and streams—every drop that is used by agriculture and industry—fell somewhere in the form of rain. Our rivers, our lakes, and our underground supply—the water which bubbles from our many springs—at one time fell as rain. And the volume of rain is fixed—controlled by the laws of nature, of which we are a part.

Generally speaking, however, we are abundantly blessed with water. But it is not always where it is needed. And it is not so abundant that we can long continue to waste it. In some areas, the demand already has exceeded the natural supply.

Already the rivers and streams—which we too often have used to carry away municipal, industrial and agricultural wastes—are being called upon to supply drinking water for thirsty, growing cities. There are all too many examples in Florida today where the waste discharge of one city is polluting the water supplies of another. Industry and agriculture also are adding their wastes to our rivers and streams, thus compounding the problems and dangers of pollution.

This free-flowing, wanton pollution of our natural water courses, actually is confounding our efforts to conserve this vital and ofttimes beautiful resource.

For on the one hand, we are spending millions of dollars here in Florida building reservoirs to trap and hold water. We are spending millions of dollars digging canals and improving river channels to move water.

We are spending millions of dollars studying our water resources, projecting demands, and developing programs for conservation.

And yet, at the same time, we are quietly—but deliberately—pouring millions of gallons—literally tons—of garbage, of poison, and other refuse and waste into that which we are trying to save. It just doesn't make sense! And it cannot be allowed to continue!

The time has come for the citizens of Florida to take a long hard look at our water resources. The time is rapidly approaching when we will have destroyed more than we have conserved.

We must clean up our water.

We must sweep pollution from our rivers and lakes.

We must demand that industries clean up their wastes, that cities treat their sewage, and demand that fertilizers and pesticides be kept out of our lakes and rivers.

For too long we have blindly ignored the threat of pollution, except as it relates to human health. We have adopted septic tank regulations, to protect us from typhoid, hepatitus, and other diseases. We have placed quarantines upon polluted oyster beds to protect us from pollution-borne diseases.

But short of this—short of halting pollution when it becomes so extreme that it is a matter of life or death—we have done very little.

The fact of the matter is that we still have no effective means of establishing and enforcing water quality controls in Florida. We still have no agency which can move in and stop anyone from pumping our waters full of pollutants, unless, of course, it endangers human health.

So long as we keep separate the responsibility both of providing and protecting water resources, we will never have an effective water resources program.

We must fuse these responsibilities together and mold them into a single comprehensive effort with a single comprehensive purpose. For we cannot think of conserving water, without thinking of protecting its quality as well as its quantity.

It is time that we created an Air and Water Quality Control Board—consisting of the Governor and the Cabinet. Thus, the executive body of Florida—those who are elected and responsible directly to the people would be directly and completely responsible for preventing and cleaning up pollution.

This board, by necessity, must have the authority to establish water quality standards, and the power to enforce them. It should have the authority to utilize every existing State agency to develop these standards and to enforce compliance with them.

We are long past the point where we can continue to ignore the impact of pollution upon our natural resources. There are many other legitimate uses of water, other than those directly involving public health. These, as well, must be considered in our program of water quality control.

To be effective, expert technical advice, as well as competent and trained enforcement personnel, must be made available to the Air and Water Quality Control Board.

This could best be accomplished through a council composed of those agencies involved with water and its varied uses. The council should consist of representatives from the Board of Conservation, the Board of Health, the Forest Service, the Board of Parks, the Agricultural Experiment Station, the Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, one member representing municipalities, and one member representing the counties.

Participation by each of these agencies effectively coordinated by the Cabinet, acting as an Air and Water Quality Control Board, would assure the citizens of Florida that our program of water quality control would be administered and enforced with full consideration to the total need, whether it be for natural resources, fish and wildlife, or human health.

Without such a "hard-nosed" approach to pollution, we will soon reach the point of diminishing returns in our conservation efforts.

The water which we seek to save will be destroyed with pollutants before it reaches the reservoirs.

The cost of conserving the water will be compounded by the cost of reclaiming it. Eventually we will be spending millions of dollars just to trap and hold the sewage of our land.

Without water quality controls, without an effective means of preventing pollution of our water resources, we would be far better off to abandon conservation programs and seek ways of expediting the flow of sewage, industrial and agricultural wastes to the seas.

But if we did, the land would soon dry up. Salt water would invade our underground water supplies. People would leave. Crops would wither. Industry would be forced to migrate to dependable and usable water supplies. And Florida would wither up into a rain-soaked desert of pollution—waiting for the evolutionary process to begin all over again.

This is the grim promise of our future, unless we can effectively marry our efforts to conserve with our efforts to protect our water resources. This is the challenge which faces us today. It is an urgent challenge which must be met with determination—lest we be guilty of destroying more than we build.

Breakthroughs in the Life Sciences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 29, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, early this month, on June 6, Georgetown University here in Washington conferred upon a distinguished alumnus, John J. Powers, Jr., an honorary degree of doctor of laws. Mr. Powers, president of Charles Pfizer & Co., in receiving this recognition typifies those leaders in business whose interests and concerns go beyond those encompassed by the corporate world.

The following day, Mr. Powers was a featured speaker at the Industrial Science and Technology Conference sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers. In his address, he discussed scientific research and the roles which can be played by government, the universities, and private industry in cooperating to eliminate the diseases which continue to plague mankind.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Powers' address may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BREAKTHROUGHS IN THE LIFE SCIENCES

(Remarks by John J. Powers, Jr.)

It was not too long ago that research directed to the discovery of medicinal products was in the main, of a fairly simple nature in the sense that it was largely empirical. Very likely this was due to the fact that there was an inadequate background of essential basic knowledge and of instrumentation to do more. The medicinal products discovered by these means such as barbiturates, digitalis, insulin, vitamins, aspirin, morphine and others, had important therapeutic value, but in the main, tended to relieve symptoms and deficiencies caused by disease and not to attack the disease itself. And some of the most serious health problems like tuberculosis, pneumonia and many other infectious diseases were scarcely touched by the older remedies.

Then came the era of the sulfa drugs and the antibiotics and the first successful far ranging attack on the causes of disease, with the spectacular results we all know so well. This was the high point of empirical research the spectacular pay-off of sheer hard work. It was characterized by a massive application of ingenious, efficient, but none-the-less empirical methods, such as the soil-screening techniques which discovered the microorganisms from which antibiotics were produced. It was backbreaking work in those days but it paid off handsomely in the relief of human suffering—and it also provided the funds for greatly increased research expenditures by the pharmaceutical industry.

As the number and variety of biologically active substances proliferated, a new excitement stirred in the world of drug research and scientists became unwilling to continue to discard all substances rejected by their screening programs. The organic chemist and the biologist, working together, speculated as to what changes in the molecular structure of a rejected substance might correct its deficiencies.

The massive search for new antibiotics, hormones and growth factors, began to give way to a systematic attempt to improve on nature. The phrase "structure-activity relationship" became highlighted in the laboratory as the chemist grappled with the riddle of molecular structure and how it might be used as a key to the expected activity of a drug. A very substantial body of knowledge began to be accumulated by those skilled in forming and reforming molecular structures. And it would be fair to ascribe to this work such important developments as the oral anti-diabetic drugs, the newer synthetic corticosteroids, the sulfonamide diuretics, the phenothiazine anti-psychotic drugs, and many others. It was because of this important work of systematic variation and selection of optimal compounds, that I have always regretted the way in which the term "molecular manipulation" came to have derogatory implications when the record shows that it has served medicine so well.

From these several—we might call them classical—techniques for seeking useful drugs, came continued progress, but by the early 1960's the pace of new drug development had slowed down. The era in which mass empirical screening dominated, successful as it was, had been mined out. And the more sophisticated structure-activity work of the biologist and the medicinal chemist, which had built upon and extended the usefulness of empirical screening, had lost momentum probably because it had used up much of the basic knowledge then available. However, this work had built a body of information and developed laboratory techniques that are now helping to launch the next era of research in the life sciences—the era of molecular biology.

The molecular—or physico-chemical approach to biology as a basic concept—can be traced back for some time, but now are the years of its spectacular growth. It has been said that there is no holding back an idea whose time has come, and this certainly is the time of molecular biology. It has influenced all sectors of biological research, from the specialist whose field is the invisible chemical reactions taking place deep inside the living cell, to the clinician who is warily administering a new drug to the first human patient. It has taken away much of the mystery of biological events, reducing them in many instances to chemical equations and physical interactions, thus finally linking up the study of life processes with all the great advances in chemistry and physics of the nuclear age.

The modern period in molecular biology might be dated from a brilliant series of discoveries in the early 1950's at the California Institute of Technology, culminating in Linus Pauling's postulation of the helical structure of proteins.

As the atom is to matter, the cell is to living things—the smallest functional unit of life. Within each cell are smaller organized units, the most important being the nucleus. The nucleus contains the chromosomes which the molecular biologists have now shown us to be strands of a giant polymer—desoxyribonucleic acid or DNA. Outside the nucleus are the cell's working parts, controlled by DNA as a switchboard controls its widely separated telephones. And the helical structure of DNA is capabale of an infinite variety of sequences and is accordingly somewhat different in each of us.

DNA is the model for the synthesis of another large, polymeric molecule, called messenger RNA, which is a blueprint for the manufacture of protein. DNA sends the messenger RNA to the ribosone, which is a protein factory in the working area around the nucleus of the cell. For each different protein to be synthesized, it sends out a different messenger RNA.

It is no imagery, but a sober fact that DNA exercises ultimate control of all functions in the cell with consequent major impact on the entire organism. It carries the genetic code—the master blueprint—which determines what cellular proteins shall be made and what the function of that cell shall be. Under the influence of appropriate control molecules, it directs the organization of cells into groups, and into organs and genetic code—the master blueprint—which groups of organs up to the whole living organism: the microbe, the tomato plant, the bumble bee, you—and me. And this code has been cracked. We now know what message is related to the production of what protein and have demonstrated the principle in living systems.

Obviously, these discoveries culminating in the cracking of the genetic code, the basic insight into how this fundamental cellular mechanism works, constitute one of the greatest scientific advances of our time. It certainly suggests to me that while we have had our telescopes trained upon a distant universe, it may be that the greatest developments of the decades ahead will be rather in the vast microscopic and submicroscopic world of the human cell. But we must realize that important as these developments are in providing a unifying concept for all of the life sciences they no more solve all our problems than Einstein's famous equation, $E=mc^2$, solved all the problems of theoretical physics.

Nevertheless our new basic knowledge in the life sciences is a true platform for growth. It is in many important respects a take-off point for the final problem solvers—the drug discoverers—and it thus imposes a grave responsibility on the industrial laboratories which are particularly skillful in this phase of research. And while there are as yet many basic knowledge gaps which will for a while limit the application of molecular biology to drug discovery, many interesting leads are being developed. Indeed industrial research in this field has become a mixture of basic knowledge and drug discovery research.

But there are deeper mysteries. Microbes do not get diabetes. Men do. And yet the knowledge gained from genetic studies with microbes may provide by far the most powerful approach to the elimination of this disease from man. Diabetes may well be traced to a defective gene somewhere on that immensely long coil of DNA. Some day we shall have the ability to correct this biochemical defect, and diabetes, and possibly other diseases, will be a thing of the past.

The application of the concepts of molecular biology is even more difficult to visualize however in the case of the chronic degenerative and metabolic diseases. There certainly will be no easy solution to these problems. In fact it is probable that their solution will depend on our first utilizing molecular biological concepts to determine the underlying causes of these disease conditions.

What are the most likely causes of these chronic degenerative and metabolic diseases? My scientific colleagues tell me that it is often possible to identify one or more regulatory processes that are out of balance in these diseases—but they cannot usually distinguish which "component" in the complex biological control network failed first, and which systems are merely readjusting to compensate for the primary malfunction. This kind of problem has sometimes been called "systems biology"—the biology of the complex, self-regulating control mechanisms that manage the house that DNA built.

Indeed it is worth noting that this moves us beyond the genetics aspects of molecular biology and involves a molecular visualization of all of the biological events of the body. For example, a visualization of energy transfer at receptor sites involved in smooth muscle control coupled with new drugs acting at these sites has led scientists in our laboratories towards a promising new approach to the management of hypertension.

Of course all this portends the beginning of an exciting new phase of medicinal product research in industry laboratories, rational rather than empirical, sophisticated beyond anything previously practiced, costly, adventuresome—but the objectives for mankind are magnificent. Now the door is open, or at least ajar, and it is not impractical for the pharmaceutical industry to consider taking on any of the ills the flesh is heir to. But brilliant as are the breakthroughs that make these considerations possible, the road ahead for the industrial researchers who must now create new drugs for the relief of human suffering in a long one. A good deal of this work can now be done with considerably greater hope of success, but much more basic new knowledge is needed if we are to satisfy within a reasonable time the high expectations for progress in health now freely discussed throughout the world. And so the basic knowledge seekers and the product researchers alike have their work cut out for them in the years ahead. I am implying, of course, that there are a number of groups at work and I think that needs some further comment.

Up to this point we have been talking about the technical breakthrough in contemporary medical research. We should not however overlook the changes in the politicoeconomic atmosphere in which this research has been carried out. Perhaps the single most important factor in medical research since 1950 has been the impressive growth of both Federal and private support, and the developing patterns of interaction between the three parties in the health research community, that is, government, the universities and industry. For example, the National Institutes of Health which do or sponsor most of the government research in the health field increased their expenditures from $73 million in 1950 to a budget in 1966 of $1.3 billion. The pharmaceutical industry in this same sixteen-year period increased its expenditures from $39 million to an estimated $355 million. In this connection it is important to understand that while there has been an increasing tendency toward government support of research through contracts with industrial laboratories, to date this amounts to something less than 5% of the total funds expended by the pharmaceutical industry for health research.

Traditionally, most government-supported work has been devoted to the development of basic knowledge and the training of young scientists but—spurred always to move faster—there has been an increasing tendency for government to work on or support work directed to the discovery and development of specific products. Concurrently, industry has found it necessary to supplement its traditional product discovery and development role with an increasing amount of basic knowledge research to help fill some of the gaps in knowledge to which I have just referred. And so the traditional lines of demarcation between government and industry in medical research are becoming blurred.

It is timely to look again at our respective roles, not only because of obvious political and economic connotations, but also to achieve the greatest efficiency in our effort to reach the challenging health goals being placed before us by the present Administration.

In hearings earlier this year before the House Committee on appropriations for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Chairman, Congressman Fogarty, asked Dr. Shannon, Director of National Institutes of Health, where he thought "the line" was between government and private industry in health research. A part of Dr. Shannon's reply was as follows: "Industry feels that the Federal dollar should be spent in two ways: One, in the support of fundamental research, and two, in the development of broad scientific competence as the basis for the educational process. They feel, in our economy, that industry is there primarily to do the developmental work leading to a product with full patent coverage. With a competitive system this is the best way they can operate.

"Indeed, I agree with them in many fields. I think there are certain fields in which they do not have the broad competence, that they do require extensive involvement with the Federal laboratories and with the academic world. It is this type of thing that we feel we play a very important role in."

As I interpret this reply, Dr. Shannon backs the traditional view that government, in the main, should support what I have been calling basic knowledge research as well as the training of young scientists, and that industry should be called upon to discover the new drugs and develop them for use in any field in which it has competence. The reference to competence is surprising. As an example of its application, Dr. Shannon referred to the history of viral vaccine development as showing in his opinion that industrial capability had not been developed to a sufficiently high point in this particular field to assure that new knowledge would be rapidly applied by industry without government help and support. But even under these circumstances, Dr. Shannon went on to say that: "Industry is an absolutely essential component. Industry must be involved and very early. They have a very important role to play. But there are certain areas where the individual corporate bodies cannot go it alone." (p. 274)

This may be true. Who can say that the need for joint action in special circumstances may not be indicated in the busy years ahead? And so it is difficult to disagree with this concept. There will probably be more debate about its application than about the concept itself. One of the problems will certainly be who is to decide the competence of industry with respect to the application to new drug research of a new piece of basic knowledge. But rather than worry this thought any further today, let us concede the need in some circumstances for joint action, and when collaboration is clearly warranted, let us plan for it as a wholehearted, cooperative effort.

In summary, then, I believe that there is a pressing need for a substantial enhancement of the infrastructure—if I may borrow a term from the economists—of basic knowledge and of trained people in the health research field. This calls for a massive effort which is beyond the power of industry alone to supply. The government is already substantially supporting this infrastructure, and in doing so releases the energies of the private sector to do what it does best; to discover new drugs and to develop their application in the practice of medicine.

Government does and can accomplish its role with its own research effort, but more importantly by financing university projects. There may also be times when the government can discharge its role by contracting for fundamental research by industry, where industry is, for special reasons, the best fitted for the job. Finally, as I have just mentioned, I think we should acknowledge that there may on rare occasion be special circumstances that would require government support of industrial medicinal product discovery but this would be considered the exception, not the rule, in delineating the responsibilities of those concerned.

I would like also to suggest that the government, in developing the research infrastructure, should pay primary attention to the training of scientists. If one factor is to be singled out for major emphasis, this is surely the one and this means strong support of the universities. In this connection the goals of government should be not merely to support to an optimal level the major centers of academic excellence, but also to help smaller universities become adequate centers for the training of scientists and the generation of useful knowledge. It is, of course, essential in stressing the importance of government financing of university efforts to realize there must be a limit. The universities must not lose their freedom and independence of action. In this paper I can only point this out but its brief treatment here does not suggest my own minimization of this important question.

A program for the development, principally by government and the universities, of a broader infrastructure of basic knowledge, made freely available to anyone, and of trained scientists, will create the platform for a tremendous forward thrust in new drug discovery and development beyond anything heretofore imagined. And to accomplish the latter is the primary responsibility and the special skill of industry, operating in a competitive climate. Some visualization such as this of the division of responsibility between the three participants in health research, it seems to me, is essential to our continued rapid progress as a nation in the health field. It is an attempt, in a time when there is so much to do to suggest the need for each group to concentrate on the thing it does best.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR CALLAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming desire of the captive peoples of east central Europe for self-determination and freedom from Communist tyranny is a factor that can too easily escape the allegiance of our alertness during this time of major focus on the war in Vietnam.

I urge my colleagues to avoid this potential oversight and wish to call to their attention the annual observances of Captive Nations Week this July 17 to 23.

The problems of the captive east central European nations belong in the forefront of international issues. Let us not so quickly forget the difficulties we have been so long exposed to because of Communist objectives in Europe. We must not focus so intently on the Vietnam situation that we forget our obligations to encourage and support all efforts to free these captive peoples from their totalitarian regimes.

Any tendency on our part to readily accept news of liberalization in Communist East Europe as a sign that the threat to freedom in that area has ended is a tendency mistaken in its identity of the overall objectives to which this nation has pledged itself.

The peoples of east central Europe are still denied fundamental human rights. Communism still maintains its stranglehold of the minds and bodies of 100 million people in this area. The woes of the captive peoples in Europe have thus not subsided. They remain a subject for major consideration in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

I urge my colleagues to renew their vital interest in the welfares of these captive millions and to endorse that part of the Captive Nations Week 1966 manifesto that accuses the Soviet Union of violating "its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive during or after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania."

Balance the Elephant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, George Todt, widely read political analyst of the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, and a solid supporter of Ronald Reagan's campaign for the governorship of California, recently wrote an interesting column of sound advice for all Republicans nationally. I take pleasure in calling it to the attention of the Congress and the country by having it printed in today's issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Todt makes a valid and important point by suggesting that those who defected from the Republican Party in 1964 should scarcely be entitled to lead or control it in 1968. He argues effectively against those in our party who would endeavor to purge from party leadership any segment of the party and suggests the mantle of republicanism is broad enough to encompass all citizens sincerely concerned about the drift toward centralized paternalism which is so evident in America today.

He also implies that the Republican Governors of 17 States out of this country's 50 who presume to embrace for themselves the right and the power to name our National Republican slate for 1968 are a bit too intoxicated by their high offices when they attempt to set themselves up as our party's spokesmen and kingmakers. After all, the delegates to our National GOP conventions rather than either our party's Governors, Senators, or Congressmen have the authority to write party platforms and to nominate candidates for President and Vice President. In the meantime, there surely must be some problems of statewide importance and significance which might better occupy the time of our country's Governors rather than having them devote so much time to playing politics in the big league and attempting to determine proper foreign policy toward Vietnam and appropriate techniques for fighting the military actions of that area.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Balance the Elephant

(By George Todt)

"I shall denounce no good Americans in my campaign. There has been too much friction inside the GOP between right, left and center in the past. We all must be tolerant of our differences and unite our total efforts for final victory."—Ronald Reagan, June 25, 1966.

A great deal of opposition and chagrin is being mounted inside important segments of the Republican party at the GOP governors meeting here at the Century-Plaza Hotel.

They seem more intent on calling the presidential nominee in '68 than getting on with the most important job—which is to improve the national image now.

Leave it all to the governors at this early date and why even bother to hold a national convention two years hence?

Or how could any future delegate expect to get hold of credentials unless first he passed a "moderate-liberal" saliva test?

Why not just wrap up the nomination and hand it to Gov. George Romney of Michigan without further ado?

A SIGN AHEAD

There are at least several important reasons why the GOP—including the august governors of 17 states—ought to "Stop, Look & Listen" first.

In the first place, the "liberal-moderates" (these names are fairly interchangeable and neither rates first in order of priority) are able to command little more than 30 per cent of the party faithful.

That was the way it was at the 1964 convention in San Francisco. And that was the way it was recently in California when Ronnie Reagan—a temperate conservative beat George Christopher by a whopping 68–31 per cent.

What cost the Elephant victory in 1964 was not a matter of the much-maligned, anti-Socialist philosophy of Barry Goldwater—but the defection of 8 million "liberal-moderate" Republicans who voted for Lyndon B. Johnson. They took a powder!

LIKE AN ARMY

A major political party is like an army, with a right wing, center and left wing. In 1964, the whole left wing of the GOP took off—all 8 million of them. And it made a gap of 16 million between Johnson and Goldwater.

If the 8 million GOP defectors had stayed home and voted for their party candidate, the arithmetic would have looked like this: 8 million added to the 27 million Goldwater received would have totaled 35 millions.

Conversely, 8 mililon subtracted from the total of 42 million received by Johnson would have left him 34 million and a deficit of one million votes.

A potential Republican triumph was surrendered because of petty differences by 8 million GOP defectors to their party standard bearer.

A LESSON HERE

For this action, the "moderate-liberals" have no real claim to first place on the 1968 ticket. Granted they know how to muddy the waters, take the party down to defeat if they please. Is this required leadership?

No, it is not. On the other hand it is not good statesmanship in the GOP to refuse to allow the left wing due representation. Give it second place.

An ideal Republican ticket in 1968 for those without axes to grind on the ideological front, might be the temperate conservative Richard Nixon named to the No. 1 spot and Gov. George Romney as Veep.

This would balance adequately the overall ticket between the far weightier GOP conservatives and the accompanying 30 percent of "liberal-moderates." Had Goldwater done so, he might have won.

Can a needed lesson be learned here?

Solution to Vietnam War—and Strategic Deterrence for Peace—Lies in Antimissile Nike-X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Rear Adm. Chester Ward, U.S. Navy, retired, former Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Navy, addressed the Commonwealth Club of California on June 24, on the subject "Solution to Vietnam War—and Strategic Deterrence for Peace—Lies in Antimissile Nike-X." A summary of his address, as published in the Commonwealth, follows:

Solution to Vietnam War—And Strategic Deterrence for Peace—Lies in Anti-Missile Nike-X

Friday Flashes—June 24th

(From address by Rear Adm. Chester Ward, U.S. Navy, retired, former Judge Advocate General of the United States Navy)

Because the lock was not put on the stable door until after the nuclear missiles had been sneaked into Cuba, scores of millions of Americans were subject to danger of imminent nuclear incineration. From that horrendous peril, we were, in the words of the Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, 'saved only by the grace of God and an aerial photograph.'

Any solution to a major Communist threat must meet four tests: (1) political possibility; (2) financial feasibility; (3) strategic soundness, and (4) it must not start a nuclear war or allow people to think it will.

The solution I suggest for Vietnam, I think, meets these tests.

It is politically possible because it requires no escalation in Vietnam. It does not widen the war into Laos or Cambodia, it doesn't involve the use of American seapower to blockade the coast or mine Haiphong.

It is financially feasible, because it does not require additional dollars in Vietnam nor investing any money that wouldn't be invested if the Communists had never tricked us into Vietnam.

SOLUTION WON'T START NUCLEAR WAR

Will it start a nuclear war? No. For the first time it will give us a defense against nuclear attack. It will vastly strengthen deterrence against nuclear war.

I do not criticize Secretary McNamara, I am in awe of the man and fear the man. I am in awe of the man because he is spending a billion dollars a week and, last November, after spending $300 billion, finally said that we are starting not to lose the war.

His idea in Vietnam is to pursue the policy of persuasion—the theory that by continuing to shoot North Vietnamese soldiers as Ho Chi Minh feeds them into South Vietnam, we can persuade Ho to stop the aggression.

We are only killing about four thousand a month, but they are being infiltrated into South Vietnam at the rate of 7,750 a month.

A critical point is that North Vietnam executes more of its own people than we could kill in two years. They do not have a high regard for human life.

TAKE WRAPS OFF AIR FORCE!

Another alternative, which military men favor, is to decide to win the war and go ahead and win it. There is practically no question that this can be done.

The Chief of Staff of the Air Force stated in December 1965 that the war against North Vietnam could be won and North Vietnam destroyed virtually overnight if the President would permit the Air Force to do it. By virtually overnight, he later explained, he meant something on the order of three weeks. He is not talking about nuclear weapons, nor killing millions of civilians, but just of taking the wraps off the U.S. Air Force. There is no question that our air and naval power can defeat North Vietnam, leaving the Vietcong with no place to go.

Only about two weeks ago, the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet advocated a naval quarantine of Haiphong, and said that, once given orders, the Navy could do it in a day or two.

APPEASERS FEAR RED CHINA

The apostles of appeasement and accommodation say that this would not end the war—that Red China and perhaps Russia would come in.

Would winning the war bring China in? If the Chinese thought they could get into the war without suffering unacceptable results, they'd be in already. They're highly vulnerable in many ways.

Bombing fifty targets in China would wipe out more than half the urban Chinese, including all the key people in government and industry. And we could destroy their newly developed nuclear production complex.

As to Russia, either we have the Soviet Communists deterred or we do not. They don't need an excuse to start a war. We are the one obstacle to their complete domination of the world. What keeps them from attack is their fear of our retaliation.

FOR HANOI?

Do you really think the Kremlin will sacrifice Soviet Russia to nuclear rubble for the sake of Hanoi? We should go ahead and win.

I feel Congress should carry out the Constitutional mandate and recognize the state of war that exists.

They tricked us into it. Remember that their motor torpedo boats attacked the Seventh Fleet. They were shelled in return, but no other response was made. Since they didn't get much reaction, they attacked again. The President had to retaliate because he was in the midst of a Presidential campaign.

It was deliberate provocation. There was no military value in attacking the Seventh Fleet or in attacking our compound and bombing the Embassy.

We owe it to the men who are going there to be shot at to recognize that a war exists.

It will have a tremendous effect in cutting down the number of lives lost needlessly. It will have a great effect on the men who are there. It will have a great effect on the home front. It will make actual treason, legal treason. It will unify the country. Americans have always pulled together in war.

It would have a terrific effect on the enemy. If we declared war, they would know we were there to stay and we would win.

REDS TRAPPED US INTO SPENDING BILLIONS ON SMALL ARMS

Why have the Communists trapped us into this situation? The answer is obvious now, but was not then. It was to trick us into spending scores of billions on tactical weapons—on aircraft, helicopters, ground materiel, anything useful in small war, and to reduce spending on strategic weapons.

You can detect the strategic aim of the enmy by the type of weapon he wants you to produce, or to stop producing. If the Communists intended to conquer the world on the installment plan, by small wars, they would not have us spending billions of dollars on the weapons to meet these wars.

What they want to do is to divert us from spending money on the big strategic weapons that will deter them from world conquest.

Expenditure on our strategic weapons is down 43%. Our spending on research and development of latest weapon systems is $1½ billion less per year.

TRICKED US INTO ORBITAL MISSILE BAN

Meanwhile the Soviets are building late model strategi cweapons. They are building an advanced system of orbital missiles.

They tricked us into the test moratorium, and again into the U.N. resolution against orbital missiles, and we stopped research.

Then last November they bragged about the orbital missiles they had produced, and said, 'ha! ha! ha!'—the U.N. resolution was against the orbiting of such missiles, but it didn't say they couldn't be designed and produced.

The Communists are about to observe the 50th anniversary of the Russian revolution. In fifty years we have never tried to outsmart the Communists.

They were so doggone smart in trapping us into Vietnam that we could turn it right back on them if we were smart enough. The only time American people spend enough to develop defense is when we are in a state of war.

The enemy's objective is Western Europe. Vietnam has no national product. Western Europe, with 340 million people, has a gross national production of 500 billion a year.

NEED MISSILE DEFENSE

There is one way that we can defeat that aim and that is by building a defense against nuclear weapons.

We now have available the Nike-X system. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended that we produce this immediately, they recommended it unanimously two years ago, the committees of Congress favor it, but McNamara won't spend the money.

Nike-X could have 70 million Americans, possibly including you and your family. I don't want to save just 70 million Americans—I want to save 180 million Americans—and the Nike-X, if we had it, could do this too."

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Q: (Hilary H. Crawford) Why did Democrats send Republicans to Saigon to pull rug from under President Diem? A: The overthrow of Diem was set up by the New York Times and the Washington Post. Despite his achievements he was anti-Communist and you can't have that!

Q: (Russell Warner) General MacArthur said that we should never get in a ground war in Asia. Why did we? A: General Taylor opposed it too. But he commented later, what could we do? They kept on sending in more troops. The answer is to develop the Nike-X. If the enemy saw that when they started a little war, we got ready for a big war, they'd stop. The Nike-X system might cost us $30 billion over six years—that's peanuts compared to the 70 million Americans a nuclear war would kill. There wouldn't be a question regarding peace in Western Europe if we hadn't worked against the credibility of our nuclear deterrence. If we had said to Russia, "you go across the line and we'll use our battlefield nuclear weapons immediately," they'd never go across. What we say is, "if you go across, we will pause and let you reflect on the seriousness of what you are doing."

Q: Should we bomb Hanoi? A: Hanoi is one great munition factory. It needs to be wiped out. We should tell the population that it will be destroyed and then go to it. By our creeping escalation, too little and too late, we have given them the chance to decentralize. The solution is more difficult now, but still possible.

Q: (R. D. Adams) Do you agree with Secretary of Defense's policy of holding reserves for a possible later duty? A: I never agree with any policy of the Secretary of Defense, because over the years, if he is for it, that's strike two against it. I don't think we need to call the reserves, I think we should pull troops from Europe. They are doing no good there. Across the border are 130 divisions. If anything broke up NATO, it is McNamara, by making it obvious that we would not use our strongest weapons against the Soviet Union, nor our tactical weapons.

Q: (Ralph Johnson) How will the war in Vietnam probably end? A: I'm afraid I know and that is one reason I feel Congress should recognize that a state of war exists. If we don't, the chances are that there will be a negotiation and at the negotiating table will be the Vietcong, and the Reds will take over as they are doing in Laos. Rusk has said that we have offered everything except the surrender of South Vietnam. If that is accepted, we have offered everything except open surrender. Coalition government with the Communists will be a victory by the Communists. If you were a Soviet, and had the problem of eliminating your principal obstacle to world conquest, how would you do it? Again and again you find Soviets blaming the German invasion on American "warmongers." We're the ones they blame for the war in Europe and against Japan. Do you see what that is? To get peace in the world, you have to eliminate the Americans, and to do this, with the least possible danger to the rest of the world, by surprise attack. That is the war plan. The way we can beat this is by building up our antimissile defense.

Community Hospital Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, with the adoption of medicare, new demands are arising on our clinic and hospital facilities and there is increasing need for the type of facilities for which a loan program was proposed in H.R. 9256, later included in the demonstration cities bill and now pending in the Senate.

The need for this sort of loan program is described in testimony given before the House Banking and Currency Committee last March 11, by Jerry Voorhis, president and executive director of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Voorhis testimony appear in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Testimony of Jerry Voorhis, Executive Director, Cooperative League of the U.S.A., Before the House Committee on Banking and Currency in Support of H.R. 9256, March 11, 1966

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: My name is Jerry Voorhis, and I appear before the committee on behalf of the Cooperative League of the USA, which organization I am privileged to serve as executive director and president.

The Cooperative League is a national federation of all kinds of mutual and cooperative enterprises in the United States. Its affiliated organizations comprise about 16,000,000 different families in their members, and they are owners of their own businesses which serve their needs for insurance, housing, marketing of farm crops, procurement of farm supplies, credit, health care, electricity, and household needs. The purpose of the Cooperative League is to encourage the use of the voluntary self-help method of solving problems which individual families cannot solve alone.

Our support of the legislation before the committee has been repeatedly and specifically expressed by biennial Congresses of the Cooperative League which is the supreme delegated authority of our organization.

The reasons for that support are as follows.

Like the Group Health Association of America, the Cooperative League believes in the better and more rational organization of medical care and health services in our country. We believe that there are four basic elements in that more rational and effective organization. One is group practice of medicine by balanced groups of doctors and professional medical personnel. Another is prepayment of the costs of medical care on a budgeted basis so as to bring the best of modern medical care within reach of as large a percentage of our people as possible. A third is preventive, comprehensive, regular care, aimed at maintaining family health and keeping people out of hospitals rather than episodic medical care which is necessarily limited to attempting to cure disease after it has been serious. And the fourth element is the opportunity and the responsibility of groups of our citizens to act voluntarily in the formation of group health plans in collaboration with groups of their doctors and nurses.

Such plans are to be found all across our country, in all sorts of communities, among all kinds and groups of people. Their basic philosophy is that the doctor should be provided with an assured income as a reward for keeping people well instead of having to depend on an uncertain income derived from people after they have become sick.

We support this legislation—H.R. 9256—because we are convinced it is necessary if voluntary constructive action by consumers of health care is to receive the encouragement it should have and to make the contribution to the better health of our people which such action can bring.

Only where the costs of preventive care are already paid and where doctors' income is thus already assured through the voluntary action of his patients—only under these circumstances is there incentive on the part of doctor and patient alike to keep people out of hospitals and thus to check the alarming increase in costs of medical care and the alarming and soon to be aggravated pressure upon both hospital space and hospital costs.

We can submit carefully compiled evidence to show that subscribers to group health plans do have hospital utilization rates which are from 50% to 80% of those of other insured groups in the population.

But for easily understood reasons group health plans face a difficult problem of receiving financing for the physical facilities they need. This has always been true and no one can accurately estimate how much benefit such plans might have brought to our country through voluntary action of its citizens if the financial problem could have been solved.

Such consumer-sponsored plans are nonprofit, of course, to begin with. They therefore cannot offer expectation of substantial earnings as security. Second, the doctors' facilities, clinic buildings, and the like, which are essential if such plans are to operate at all, are single-use buildings and therefore not in the nature of prime objects of investment by financial institutions. Third, in many many cases the need is greatest in smaller communities where even if the local bank desires to make such loans, it simply lacks the resources with which to do so unless a guarantee is provided such as H. R. 9256 could give. Fourth, while the members and subscribers to such plans—or the potential members and subscribers to such plans—could and indeed have put up enough contribution to finance the *operations* of a plan, there are many, many instances where they are quite unable to subscribe the amounts of money necessary to finance expensive modern health facilities.

Let me cite a couple of examples.

First, take the case of a small community threatened with loss of its only hospital and of all its doctors and where families subscribed $100 each to provide their town with desperately needed modern clinic facilities. Some $45,000 was needed to complete construction of these facilities over and beyond what could be raised by the people's efforts. In the absence of legislation like H.R. 9256, it took 15 years before these earnest people were able to borrow the funds necessary to supplement their own and to provide the facilities their town needed.

Another case is one where an already established group health plan in a rural area is ready and willing to construct a branch clinic in a neighboring community. The nearest hospital to this community is 30 miles away. And no facilities exist where efficient medical service could be provided or where, in fact, well trained modern physicians are willing to practice. So the need is obvious. The local bank is quite willing to make a loan to finance the needed facility but it simply does not have adequate reserves and is not large enough to take the admitted risk of financing a building which it would obviously have considerable difficulty in selling in case foreclosure became necessary. Were H.R. 9256 on the statute books the local bank could and would make this loan, doctors could be attracted to this community and the health of the people protected.

Many similar examples could be given, both from other rural areas, to which the legislation would give preference and also from cities where labor-sponsored and cooperative consumer-sponsored group health plans could care for much larger memberships if only they could receive the financing for the additional physical facilities they need.

Finally, we submit that with the advent of the medicare program, the pressure upon existing health facilities will be greatly intensified. Indeed something approaching a crisis in this respect may result. What better way of forestalling such a crisis than by encouraging through a loan guarantee program the kind of constructive action on their own behalf which groups of our people are endeavoring to take through developing of group health plans like those about which I have been speaking?

In times like the present it indeed seems the part of both wisdom and statesmanship to encourage voluntary action by the people of this country in attacking and solving their own problems—that of health economics at their forefront.

For these reasons The Cooperative League of the United States hopes that this distinguished committee will report favorably upon H.R. 9256 and the other measures now before you and that they can be enacted into law at an early date.

Rules for Hosts and Guests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, from the editorial columns of the Christian Science Monitor comes a sound and pertinent discussion of the unhappy situation provoked in New York during the visit to this country by King Faisal:

Rules for Hosts and Guests

The uproar over King Faisal's visit to New York was a comedy of errors that should never have happened. Nobody comes out of it with credit—even if it is possible to explain why they spoke and acted as they did. The United States is a great power. It is appropriate that it move with majesty and command respect. King Faisal's hosts in Washington conducted themselves with that in mind. It remains to be seen whether the beneficent effect of their hospitality has been undone by what subsequently happened.

According to a correspondent of this newspaper, the whole thing started when a reporter submitted in writing to the moderator at King Faisal's news conference a question that was intended as a joke. We would have expected journalists with some acquaintance of international propriety—which presumably goes with being a Washington correspondent—to be discriminating and sensitive enough to avoid initiating the kind of charade that followed.

If King Faisal was to answer candidly any question put to him about his or Arab attitudes toward Israel, he was bound to offend those sections of American opinion with a commitment to the Zionist movement. Nobody can take exception to such Americans objecting to any statement by King Faisal criticizing them. But in a wider context, it should be remembered that Arabs have just as deep a feeling of having been wronged as do Israelis and their partisans.

Wryly, there is still doubt about what exactly King Faisal said. The New York Times correspondent covering his news conference concluded his dispatch with an observation to the effect that some observers in the capital felt the most significant thing in King Faisal's remarks was his implied backing away from "the objective espoused by some Arab extremists—destruction of Israel."

Non-Americans may fail to appreciate the terrific political pressures that operate in New York City. And they may need to be reminded that the Jewish population of the city is roughly equivalent to that of the entire state of Israel. To state this does not necessarily imply approval of what Mayor Lindsay or Governor Rockefeller did, when their doing so must seem to outsiders a snub to a head of state in New York while still the official guest of the United States Government.

The lesson to be learned from all this is that Americans at every level must in some measure allow to devolve upon themselves the responsibility and the sensitivity which their land and their government have been called upon to manifest in the world that has emerged from World War II. The United States makes sense and can count on well-being only so long as its citizens and its government remain dedicated to the principles enshrined in the Founding Documents. These imply above all else the pursuit of justice and the purging of hatreds that corrode the human race.

All those involved in any way in the uproar in New York should not lose sight of this foundation upon which the Republic is based. That foundation will remain when the pettiness of some aspects of this incident has been forgotten. And we trust that King Faisal's sagacity will enable him to recognize this fact when the unpleasant dust of the past few days has settled.

Equal Opportunity Is Good Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on May 19, Charles W. Meares, executive vice president of the New York Life Insurance Co., delivered an address concerning equal employment opportunity.

Entitled "Is Equal Opportunity Good Business?" Mr. Meares' address is replete with examples of how nondiscrimination in hiring practices is not only right, but good business practice. Urging inservice training programs, recruiting of minority groups, and a rejection of "tokenism," Mr. Meares' address will make good reading for business leaders throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS EQUAL OPPORTUNITY GOOD BUSINESS?

If I were asked which year of my 43 in the business I consider to be the most significant one to life insurance and to management in general—I would answer this one . . . right now. Few moments in business history have been as pregnant as the current one with the ferment of constructive change and progress. I'd like to discuss one of these areas of ferment with you tonight. It is one that is highly significant to us all, as managers and businessmen. And it is one in which you Fellows and Associates can be enormously effective in implementing progress.

The area I speak of—is equal employment opportunity. The issue of equal opportunity is certainly of deep concern to us all—as businessmen and as believers in democracy. In regard to this, there's a significant passage in George Orwell's satiric parable, "Animal Farm." Some of the animals on a farm lead the others in a revolt against a tryannous farmer. But, after the tyrant has been overthrown, the plowhorse finds he is being as overworked and badly treated under the supposedly enlightened new order as he was by the farmer. "I thought all animals were equal," the horse complains. "They are," the leader of the revolt explains jovially, "but some are more equal than others."

There's no denying that traditional patterns of discrimination in American life have often caused Negroes and other minority groups to justifiably feel that "some are more equal than others." But these patterns are finally changing as more and more Americans are coming to realize that anything less than a fully democratic society—is a non-democratic society. Now others can speak with greater eloquence than myself about the moral and ethical basis of equal opportunity. I'd like to explore it from the one standpoint which is especially important to all businessmen—the standpoint of profitability.

I'm sure we'd all agree that equality of opportunity is a pie-in-the-sky term unless society has the kind of economic strength and growth which makes real opportunity possible. In our society, that strength comes from the competition of private enterprise—the profit system. Profits enable an industry to expand, thus creating new jobs, new opportunities, a higher standard of living.

Businessmen tend to look at the population in terms of potential markets not only for their goods and services but also for their changing labor needs. Today there are over 20 million Negro Americans. They do have a growing middle class, and Negro professionals, businessmen, technicians and so forth have always made important contributions to American life. More and more are doing so today. Yet the unvarnished fact remains that for most Negroes opportunity has been traditionally limited, jobs low-grade and unemployment high. Unless this climate is changed, the unemployment situation is bound to get worse, especially since automation is removing whole categories of low-level jobs.

Now this situation is hardly profitable to anybody. For many Negroes it has meant lives of unending poverty and hopelessness, passed along from generation to generation. Such an environment is a seed-bed of crime, of swollen welfare rolls and other conditions highly unprofitable to society as a whole. It's certainly without profit to those of us, in New York, for example, who must look to the increasing Negro labor market for future manpower—nor to businessmen who are being deprived of a prosperous Negro market for their goods and services.

What can we do—we business people—to help solve this problem? First, let's consider the role played by traditional hiring practices. When the tradition has been discrimination by race or color, this has obviously presented a stone wall to Negro aspiration. But even when companies such as ours reject unfair discrimination, they are forced to practice another kind which has been a serious factor in the problem.

For we must all discriminate in terms of skills. We owe it to our stockholders, policyowners, the job security of our employees, to be able to compete successfully. And that means seeking those whose ability, training and potential will make it profitable for our companies to hire them.

A real difficulty has been in finding sufficient numbers of qualified Negroes for the skilled job and management-training opportunities which are available. To some degree, this is a communications problem. Sometimes, qualified Negroes aren't aware of these openings. Sometimes, they are aware of them, but don't apply because they don't really believe they will get a fair shake.

We all need to do a more vigorous job of getting the message across—that we're really serious about equal opportunity—to minority-group communities and organizations themselves. For example, at New York Life, we work closely with the Urban League, telling them of stenographic, secretarial and clerical openings, and urging them to send us qualified applicants. We recruit at high schools and colleges with a large proportion of Negroes and other minority group members in their student bodies. Our recruiters make it clear to placement counsellors that jobs will really be open to all qualified graduates, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin. We distribute material which tells young people just what careers are possible in the insurance field, and what the qualifications are.

But it's not enough to hire new people and just leave it at that. All new people—especially if they come from disadvantaged backgrounds—need to feel welcome, to be encouraged, to feel they can rise as high as their abilities can take them.

Company policy—promotion from within—refunding the night school tuition costs of ambitious employees, and so forth—can be of great help here. But I believe it is you managers and senior people in the business, by the kind of sympathetic guidance you give, who can, in the long run, exert the greatest influence for good. I'm not suggesting that you become unselfish do-gooders. Merit and ambition ought to be encouraged because of their long-term profitability to your companies.

Still, there's no doubt that concrete encouragement of this kind can help a disadvantaged person to raise his sights because he feels that others are interested in his future, his human potential. That's extremely important.

I'd like to speak out at this point against "tokenism"—maintaining a few "showcase" Negroes in scattered jobs as insurance against accusation of discrimination. Management shouldn't hire Negroes just because they're Negroes, and shouldn't keep anybody, Negro or otherwise, on the payroll if he won't shape up even after attempts have been made to help him. "Tokenism" won't solve the problem of Negro unemployment. Being taken on or kept on as a "special case" who doesn't have to measure up against general standards isn't going to build the Negro's—or anybody's—confidence. I believe that such practices are not only hypocritical—they are highly unprofitable.

However, mere voluntary compliance with the principle of equal opportunity isn't going to solve the problem, either. Even aggressive recruiting within the Negro community—working with the Urban League and other organizations—hasn't enabled my Company to find as many qualified Negro applicants for our job openings as we'd like. The problem seemed largely one of education and development. This was an area where we felt a company such as ours could help, in terms of both our own needs and those of youngsters who might be salvaged from the hopelessness of chronic unemployment or low-salaried poverty.

In cooperation with the National Urban League, we launched a special Stenographic Development Program in July 1964. Twenty-eight young women, mostly from Negro and other minority groups, attended free classes in one of our training rooms 15 hours a week for 6½ weeks. We retained N.Y.U. to help us give them intensive, practical instruction in shorthand, typing, English, filing, telephone techniques, and other skills. All 28 young women completed the course, applying themselves well to self-improvement, and demonstrating especially good attitude and attendance.

Although we had made no commitments as to jobs, we were so impressed with these young ladies that we made offers of steno jobs to 10 of them. Six accepted our offers, the other 4 apparently felt they could do better elsewhere. We repeated the program in 1965 with equally encouraging results, and are continuing it through 1966. Incidentally, we've tried to follow up on the progress of the original group, and it would appear that 25 out of the 28 young people have either gotten jobs or are continuing their educations and seem well on the road to productive and rewarding lives.

Statistics like these suggest that this kind of educational program will definitely pay off in skilled employees . . . and salvaged lives. Of course, education is a 2-way street and must extend to the new employee's coworkers. Once a minority group member is hired, he or she may run up against attitudes, prejudices, passive resistance, which make it hard for the new employee to succeed. Like many companies, we hold meetings with our management and office staffs and distribute educational literature which says, in effect: "Your Company is totally committed to equal employment opportunity. All we ask is that you give these new employees the same chance to prove themselves that we gave you. Let the proof be in the pudding."

The surprising thing is, that many anticipated problems never deveolp. Once the older employees see that the newcomer does his job well, is cooperative and considerate, fear and suspicion tend to melt away, myths dissolve before reality, and the newcomer is accepted. Of course, it's not all roses, and some attitudes resist change; but if employees see that a Negro co-worker has been hired or promoted for merit alone—that's why it's so important—the acceptance problem can be overcome. Apropos of this, a recent American Management Association survey asked a number of firms the results of promoting Negro supervisors over mixed groups of employees. Ninety out of 92 firms reported there had been no problem when Negroes attained supervisory status on demonstrated ability.

And so, another myth bites the dust.

In regard to our minority group employees, I'm happy to report that their job performances and morale seem to be no different from the job performance and morale of our other employees.

Up to now, I've discussed equal employment opportunity in terms of our experiences—and the conclusions to be drawn from them—in hiring office personnel. But perhaps the most enlightening experience we've had has been with the agents in the Field.

As you well know, recruiting agents with with the necessary talent and qualifications is a difficult problem all insurance companies share. Keeping them is another. Insurance selling is one of the most fiercely competitive of all professions.

Now, tradition has said that Negroes couldn't succeed as agents for white insurance companies. They wouldn't be able to service large enough markets. People wouldn't trust their financial judgment. And so forth. With so much going against them, it was felt, they would discourage easier, produce less, drop out quicker than the average.

So said tradition. Now we at New York Life are great believers in tradition; after all, we're 120 years old. But we're also in the business of taking risks, and we decided that giving Negro agents a chance to prove this tradition wrong was a human risk well worth taking.

Remember again that our approach had to be profit-oriented, not pro-Negro nor pro any other minority group but simply pro-New York Life. We had to apply the same severe selection standards to all agents since failure would mean many dollars lost to the Company, the general manager, the policyowners.

We were among the first of the non-Negro insurance companies to hire Negro agents. And among the first we hired were Cirilo A. McSween of Chicago and Theodore R. Tillman of Philadelphia who began working for us as full-time agents in 1957. Within a year, each had written more than a million of "paid-for" insurance. Every year since, each has repeated this accomplishment. And in the last year, each has produced over $2 million worth of business.

Profitable? You bet.

When our other general managers saw what could be done, they were anxious to get on the band wagon. After all, records like these could mean money in their pockets.

Cirilo McSween and Ted Tillman now have lots of comapny—and competition too. Last year, for example, New York Life had 43 Negro agents on its rolls. And, collectively, they sold a total of $23 million of ordinary paid insurance—better than the Company average. And I should make it clear that these sales are being produced from mixed markets.

Is it any wonder that this year we've already raised the number of Negro agents to more than 65?

Incidentally, there are only 3 Negro members of the famous Million Dollar Round Table—and I'm afraid I can't resist the temptation to brag that all 3 are New York Life agents.

One of the most heartening aspects of the story has been in the area of human relations. Agents with good records are invited to attend Sales Educational Conventions and Career Conferences. They often bring their wives and, while the get-togethers are very largely business, they are in part social. Sometimes the meetings take place down South, where our Company is particularly strong. It was thought that this might cause a strain, where Negro agents were concerned.

Now, we had insisted from the first that all agents be permitted to go wherever their earnings would take them. So qualified Negro agents were invited to all conventions and conferences. They were booked at the same hotels, invited to all functions. The results? The hotels have proved no problem at all. And as far as acceptance by the other agents is concerned . . . the experience of Negro Agent Dennis Henry is an encouraging example. A millionaire producer in his first year, Dennis recently served as vice president of his Career Conference—out of 35 first-year agents. This took place in Atlanta, Georgia, and Dennis was elected by his fellow agents themselves—all white southerners!

So much for tradition. So much for myth.

And that about sums up our experiences to date.

I won't deny that there's more to do at New York Life—and we're going to do more, especially since the steps we've taken so far have proved so profitable to us. But they couldn't have been successfully taken without the cooperation and skill in human relations of our Company-wide management team.

It is you people, after all, who have the greatest responsibility—and opportunity—for implementing this kind of progress. I leave you tonight with the confidence that you share my own conviction about the practice of democracy.

It's not only just, ethically right, and, in some cases long overdue.

It's good business.

Thank you once again, Miss Votteler, for your award and the great compliment you have paid me this evening—and thank you ladies and gentlemen for your kind attention.

Incentive Income for AFDC Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a recent resolution of the Minnesota Governor's Commission on the Status of Women reveals the need for allowing AFDC mothers to become self-reliant by finding employment that can become part of their families' support.

Anticipating this resolution by the Minnesota commission, I introduced a bill, H.R. 15167, to permit recipients of AFDC aid to retain the first $85 of monthly income and one-half of all income over $85. A similar measure is, in fact, already in operation for mothers working in programs under the Economic Opportunity Act.

I have also introduced H.R. 13073 to permit similar income procedures for mothers working under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Mr. Speaker, the excellent resolution of the Minnesota Governor's Commission on the Status of Women follows:

Resolution by Minnesota Governor's Commission on the Status of Women on Incentive Income and Enlarged Opportunities for Education and Training of AFDC Mothers, May 20, 1966

The basic purpose of AFDC is to "provide, for families with breakdown in parental functioning, a reasonable standard of maintenance and medical care and the opportunity for self-support and to strengthen family life."

While a large number of mothers of young children still regard child-rearing as full-time activity, and should be encouraged to do so, nevertheless many mothers can and wish to be self-reliant by working.

Under existing law, those mothers who wish to work are required to report their earnings and these are substantially subtracted from their AFDC payment.

The existing law provides little financial advantage for the AFDC mother to be employed, thus stifling initiative and ambition; and thus denying those mothers who wish to work a sense of competence and independence derived from improving the standard of living of their children; and discouraging mothers from participating in the dignity of work to improve their lot in life.

This situation does not realistically emphasize that portion of the purpose of AFDC which states that the program should provide "The opportunity for self-support and to strengthen family life."

The existing law provides little encouragement for the AFDC mother to seek opportunities to continue her education and seek training and work experience to prepare for her own self-support, as her children grow older and she is no longer eligible for AFDC.

The Federal Government has accepted the principle of a realistic incentive income by permitting AFDC mothers who work on the programs of the Economic Opportunity Act, Title I and Title II, to retain a portion of their earned income. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Governor's Commission on the Status of Women encourages Congress and the State Legislature to strengthen the law to permit wider opportunities for AFDC mothers to continue their education and training; and to change the laws both federal and state in order to establish a policy of incentive income that will be both realistic and reasonable; that will enhance self-support, normal participation in the community, and a spirit of enterprise in the family.

The Revolution at 190

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Chicago Daily News of July 2, 1966, in commemoration of Independence Day, reminds Americans of the origins of and the principles underlying their system of government. As the memory of Independence Day of 1966 still lingers on, all Americans should ponder well the thoughts expressed in this editorial, which follows:

THE REVOLUTION AT 190

These were not dirty-necked rabble-rousers, but substantial citizens—lawyers mainly, and merchants and plantation owners and a printer named Franklin. But they were radicals according to any standard of their time.

What they wrote they felt deeply, for to sign the words was to risk reprisals at least, and at worst the hangman's rope.

They wrote of independence, and what it consisted of, and how its absence had made life intolerable in the colonies.

Independence, they declared, involved government with the consent of the governed, and the preservation of certain "unalienable" rights, among these being "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

But their Declaration was full of strong verbs, and the context clearly establishes that life, liberty and happiness were not viewed as pleasurable birthrights, like grandfather clocks, to be handed down from father to son, but as opportunities to be taken up and used. They clearly meant unalienable right to *live* life, to *pursue* happiness, to *exercise* liberty and—as they were soon to prove—*defend* it.

As for independence, their whole document testifies to their conviction that this applied, first of all, to the mind and spirit—the right of the individual to think, not as George III or *any* ruler advised, but as he, himself, thought best.

This, they felt, was the wellspring of individual integrity, and thus of mutual faith and common strength. If a man was scrupulously honest with himself he was bound to be honest straight through. And an aspect of that honesty was a willingness to invest energy and sweat for an equitable return.

For a century and a half, the proposition worked so superbly that this country began piling up a great surplus of productivity. Having found the magic formula to release the creativity of the free human spirit, we began to reach the point where resourcefulness was no longer needed to meet our basic needs. There was enough for all, and to spare. The work week slid from 60 and more hours to 48, to 40, to 37 and on down. The sick, the halt and the aged were relieved of concern for their basic needs. Cradle-to-grave security came into sight for all.

But it didn't turn out to be all peaches and cream.

Suddenly the clerk in the store doesn't really need you and your custom. You can take his indifferent service, or go elsewhere.

Suddenly the contract between individuals loses some of its sanctity. If a man doesn't really need your money, your job can wait.

Suddenly the zeal to please—to do an expert repair job, or build a lasting product, or create a permanent customer—goes limp.

Gradually a new class of people is born—those who feel no constraint to work for a living. The relief rolls bulge, and some families manage to make the dole not only a career but a tradition, through the second and third generations.

And coupled with all this has been a widespread retreat from troublesome mental and spiritual challenges. Millions have grown too shiftless to do their own reasoning. They adopt "safe" viewpoints, surround themselves by "safe" friends and neighbors, and reject dissenting voices as radical and therefore to be shunned.

There are dangerous radicals around, to be sure, but they have never been the prime danger in this land of the free. The prime danger has been that we would run out of radicals of any kind. The result would be as tragic for freedom today as it would have been in 1776, when a little band of troublemakers put their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor on the line for the right to differ.

In short, there has been serious erosion of both discipline and vigor within the national mind and spirit. And with this, inevitably, came an erosion of respect—self-respect and respect for others.

It is a curious result, from a system invented to serve exactly opposite ends, and that served them so well for so long a time.

The histories of Greece, Rome and the great empires of Europe tell us, however, that it is not so curious after all. The cycles have been dictated by human nature as the lean and hungry strove for success and the rich and indolent let it slip away.

This is a time of danger as great as that of 1776. But who can hear the quiet ticking of the nuclear clock, or mark the silent hardening of hatred between one people and another? We are not accustomed to danger in these subtle forms.

And yet we have a heritage of resourcefulness, two centuries long, that has seen us through a catalog of crises ranging from the bloody agony of the Civil War to the bloodless triumph of the Marshall Plan. Perhaps a new generation now trying to drown the tolling of the doomsday clock in the tintinnabulation of the amplified guitar—the first children of the nuclear age—will hear a trumpet over the din, and get back in touch with destiny.

A Letter of Appreciation From an Ex-GI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a remarkable letter from an ex-GI living in our area, which was written on July 4, expressing his deep appreciation and gratitude for the treatment afforded our veterans. In addition to his appreciation for the services rendered the disabled veterans this letter is a fine recognition of loyalty as indicated by his thanks to this country in general, on its birthday.

The expressions in this letter are all the more unusual because this veteran has given almost his last drop of devotion to this country, and perhaps had it not been for the outstanding medical services furnished the GI's, he may well have been one of those who gave his life for his country. His thoughtful letter follows:

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF.,
July 4, 1966.

Hon. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
Representative in Congress,
San Mateo, Calif.

DEAR MR. YOUNGER: I cannot let this glorious birthday of our country go by without expressing my gratitude and appreciation for the care and treatment given to veterans by this nation.

When I was released from an army hospital after two and a half years of orthopedic and plastic surgery, the army doctors told me that they had done all that they could do at the time. They told me that after two or three years, when the skin had loosened up on my face, more work could be done to improve my appearance.

However, I have a good-sized family, (four children) and have not been able to take off work to go to a distant Veterans Hospital for this surgery. (I had one operation at Fort Miley in San Francisco.)

So, Mr. Younger, I am thankful for the wonderful, large Veterans Hospital recently erected in Palo Alto. I can run over for an appointment in the E.E.N. & T. Clinic and only lose an hour or an hour and a half from my work.

They have an expert plastic surgeon for a consultant there, Dr. Howard Martin, and such conscientious, talented VA doctors.

The army tried twice to open my left nostril so that I could breathe through it. Both times, however, scar tissue grew back and obstructed and opening. Dr. John Epley and Dr. Richard Good, under Dr. Martin's supervision have been able to improve the appearance of my face and have succeeded in opening my left nostril.

If you have an opportunity some time, I wish you could express my thanks and gratitude to the Congress of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES J. SHIELDS.

Florida Newspaperman Wins Forestry Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement from John McMahon, farm forester in Okaloosa County, Fla. It tells of the good work for forestry being done by a local newspaper, the Okaloosa News-Journal.

The statement is as follows:

FLORIDA NEWSPAPERMAN WINS FORESTRY AWARD

(By John McMahon, farm forester)

A Crestview newspaper editor has won a press award from the Society of American Foresters for the best publicity of forestry in a weekly paper for 1965. The award was presented at the Florida Section's meeting in Gainesville on June 23rd.

Mr. Ed Broderick, recipient of the award was born in Buffalo, New York. He had resided in northeastern Ohio in the Cleveland area before moving to Florida about 12 years ago.

At present he is the owner and editor of the Okaloosa News-Journal published at Crestview, Fla. He received a B.A. degree in Journalism from the University of Michigan in 1924 and later acquired a Masters degree in English from the Western Reserve University in Cleveland.

Mr. Broderick has demonstrated his interest in forestry not only in a journalistic way, but also by planting about 125 acres of slash pine on his farm in the Galliver community near Crestview. Even though he has objectively publicized all the social, economic and industrial activities in his paper, he has given consistently good coverage to conservation, recreation, wildlife and forestry. He has been especially generous in giving public agencies space in promoting their various programs to help educate the public.

He admits that part of his interest in the great outdoors is due to his wife. Mrs. Broderick gives local lectures on trees and bird life, and is well known as a horseback riding fan. Mrs. Broderick is a journalist in her own right and composes a human interest column on local events and people. Their daughter Terry, is also a hard working member in the family news business.

Mr. Broderick has won two other newspaper awards in Florida in recent years. In 1962 he won the best traffic safety editorial presented by the National Trucking Association. In 1964 he won an award from the Press Association for the best editorial in a Florida publication.

He is also an active member of the Forest Fire Prevention Committee whose members are appointed by State Forester Coulter to assist the Florida Forest Service in promoting and carrying out its various programs.

Mr. Broderick has an outstanding reputation for personal integrity, professional ability and public service in his community and has won the respect and affection of his neighbors.

Farm Forester John McMahon, who has worked closely with Mr. Broderick in promoting forestry, says he is delighted to see such a fine gentleman and capable journalist receive the S.A.F. Award, and congratulates both the Society and Mr. Broderick for their activity in promoting forestry.

"The real challenge to a forester is in getting people outside the profession to help promote forestry. In our particular business this is a hard job, because only one person in every 10,000 is a forester. Furthermore, forestry is a rather quiet subject when compared to space travel, sex, war, and the Dow-Jones average. But with the help of conservation minded editors like Mr. Broderick, we can get a forceful message to the average man about his relationship to the forest. With urban population increasing it is important that both the volume and quality of forestry publicity be expanded," according to McMahon.

"We Ask You"—A Prayer Offered by Dr. Walter Menninger of Topeka, Kans., at a Rotary Meeting Held Shortly After the June 8 Tornado in That City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, any person who survives a natural disaster the likes of the tornado which struck Topeka, Kans., on June 8, has the right to wonder, "Why was I spared, while my neighbor was buried and killed? Why did my property escape damage while nothing remains of the house next door?"

Searching for the answers brings those who survived a little closer to their Creator, and Dr. Walter Menninger, of Topeka, becomes their spokesman in a prayer which he offered as an invocation at a Topeka Rotary Club meeting. This prayer was reprinted in the Topeka, Kans., Daily Capital, and should have the attention of all my colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the prayer, "We Ask You" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The prayer follows:

WE ASK YOU . . .

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The imponderables posed by a calamity of the proportions of the June 8 tornado were explored by Dr. W. Walter Menninger, of the Menninger Foundation, who delivered the invocation at a meeting of Rotary Club of Topeka Thursday at the Hotel Jayhawk.)

Let us pray . . .

Praise God from whom all blessings flow.

But, Lord, it's hard for us to readily accept adversity, to tolerate profound pain, and to understand why Fate seems to capricious, why some of us were devastated two weeks ago and others untouched. We couldn't help but be reminded of our relative impotence and our helplessness in the face of this Greater Power.

Most of us are again carrying on our "business as usual," yet, in the middle of this busy day, we interrupt our personal pursuits and pause. And we ponder. And we ask You . . .

What should we have learned from Your Infinite Wisdom? Are we fully open in our understanding? Or are we nearsighted and missing Your communications?

Did You mean to remind us of our oneness as human being struggling to survive, of the fallacy of being self-centered and too contented, of Your proverb that "Pride goeth before destruction and an haughty spirit before a fall," of the necessity to think beyond ourselves and our immediate interests?

And in those brilliant, still moments after the storm had passed, did You mean to remind us of the brightness and glory that can follow adversity? Did You intend us to realize how we must help one another to achieve that goal, and understand the thought behind a Nigerian proverb which says, "When the right hand washes the left hand, the right hand becomes clean also."

As we consider these imponderables, will You please help us to understand how to accept and deal with the plight of those who have suffered and who are angry and resentful at being devastated or hurt. And assist us all in our responsibilities to lead others to bring forth new hope from our calamity.

We ask this, in Jesus' name. Amen.

Margaret Creek Watershed Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1966

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, today I want to congratulate the fine citizens of my district, who last week finalized details for the construction of the first dam for the Margaret Creek watershed project in Athens County in the 10th Congressional District of Ohio.

I wish to personally commend Mr. Perry Munn, chairman, of the Margaret Creek Conservancy District, whose untiring leadership has brought this project to reality.

The contract, signed last week, for $117,000 will be for a multiple-purpose flood prevention fish and wildlife reservoir. Of the cost, $95,238 will come from Federal funds and $16,000 of the remainder will come from the Ohio State Department of Natural Resources. The 46-acre fish and wildlife reservoir to be created will be operated by this department.

The Margaret Creek watershed area covers 38,600 acres. The purposes of the watershed plan are to reduce flood damages and soil erosion, provide municipal water storage, and also provide for water recreation, and fish and wildlife use. The planned works, in addition to the above-mentioned reservoir, include four flood prevention impoundments, another multiple-purpose reservoir, and almost 10 miles of channel improvements. The entire program will be installed over the next 5 years.

The monetary benefits from the total watershed structure program are estimated at $96,173 yearly. Most of this—$85,449—will come from flood prevention, water supply, and recreational use. About $2,065 will come from redevelopment benefits and $8,659 from secondary benefits.

About 96 percent of the Margaret Creek watershed area is in agricultural land. Frequent floods cause extensive damage to lands, buildings, and transportation facilities.

In March of 1964, Margaret Creek overflowed its banks and covered 1,200 acres, causing damages estimated at $40,750.

In March of 1963, flood damages of $51,000 were reported. And in the summer of 1961, an estimated 1,100 acres were inundated, causing $30,600 worth of damage. Obviously, there is a clear need for flood prevention measures in this area.

New methods of water management are also necessary. The city of Albany has increased its population 57 percent since 1950. The water supply is rapidly diminishing and does not now meet present demands. In addition, a recently created school district is planning to build a new school and this will create further needs.

As for outdoor recreation, this is a must, not a luxury, in today's urban society. Parks, beaches, and picnic areas were jammed all over the country this past holiday weekend, and authoritative sources estimate that by the year 2000, our outdoor recreational needs will triple, although our land area, of course, will not grow by an acre.

The Hocking River Valley, in which Margaret Creek watershed is located, is one of the most scenic areas in Ohio. At present, the nearest State park provides facilities only for picnicking. I am pleased that the Margaret Creek watershed plan is including swimming, fishing, and other basic facilities for outdoor recreation in its plan. In addition, the recently signed contract for the first reservoir to be built will also create a 46-acre fish and wildlife sanctuary for rabbits, squirrels, muskrats, and other species of wildlife in the area.

The sponsors of the watershed project are the Athens County Board of Commissioners, the Athens Soil and Water Conservation District, the Margaret Creek Conservancy District, the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, and the village of Albany. Federal assistance is provided by the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service.

I know all these people have worked long and hard for this project, and I congratulate them on achieving this interim milestone of the signing of the first contract for construction. With the continued support and assistance of these sponsors, I know the project will be successfully completed.

The Feast of Cyril and Methodius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, as we mark the feast of SS. Cyril and Methodius, it is fitting to consider also the observance of Slovak independence. These two apostles of the Slavs in introducing Christianity in Slovakia in the middle of the ninth century, also brought in the idea of freedom to Slovakia. Since then, these brave and industrious people have clung as tenaciously to the tenets of Christianity as they have to the idea of freedom and independence. The Christianity thus preached in Slovakia by these two Byzantine missionaries became, in the course of centuries, the principal binding force among the Slovak people, the very core of their spiritual unity.

In the course of their turbulent history the Slovaks have preserved this spiritual unity. Unfortunately, however, they have not been as successful in retaining their national political freedom and unity. At the end of the First World War they united with the Czechs and formed the Czechoslovak Republic. In 1939 when the Czechoslovak Republic was broken up, then Slovaks proclaimed their independence, only to fall under the oppression of Nazi Germany. Since the end of the war they were once more united with the Czechs and today they enjoy some form of autonomy in the People's Republic of Czechoslovakia.

All loyal and patriotic Americans of Slovak descent have maintained some spiritual ties with the land of their Slovak forebears. Here in this great republic they have appreciated the opportunities offered to them, and they have made the best of these opportunities. They have numerous welfare, educational and philanthropic organizations, all of them rendering invaluable services to American-Slovak communities. Particularly strong is the Sokol, an organization devoted primarily to the physical development of the youth, and also very active in the improvement of the mind, in educational work.

A Friend Says the Last "Goodby"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the news of each day is so dominated by big names and big events that we often lose sight of the fact that communities and nations are actually made up of individuals, the majority known only to friends and relatives. It is not necessary that any of these individuals be famous or acclaimed by history for them to live out their lives in such a manner as to create a reservoir of good feeling touching all who may have known them.

The sudden passing of one such man recently, leaving his friends shocked and bewildered, was memorialized in a manner which reflects the loss felt by all members of the community. As a final mark of my respect for a man who typified the phrase "good citizen," I offer this touching and sincere tribute to the late Eddie Byrnside, as written by his friend Dean Morrison and published in the St. Albans, W. Va., Advertiser on June 30, 1966:

A REQUIEM FOR EDDIE BYRNSIDE

"In the midst of life we are in death."—Traditional.

"God's finger touched him, and he slept."—Tennyson

"The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away. Blessed be the name of the Lord."—The Holy Bible

These words are for Eddie.

In the heat of summer in the closing days of the beautiful month of June, George (Eddie) Byrnside passed away.

Funeral services for Mr. Byrnside were held on Tuesday of this week, and he was buried in Cunningham Memorial Park, in St. Albans.

These few words, therefore are a requiem for Eddie Byrnside.

He was a good man, fine, honest, polite, courteous, a hard working, busy minded, enterprising, intelligent individual.

It has often been said that the good die young, and Eddie Byrnside was relatively young, dying at only 49.

Eddie Byrnside was a man involved in many enterprises: a filling station operator, a driver of a school bus, an ex-military serviceman, a justice of the peace, a councilman-at-large of a growing city, a member of the Abney St. Church of God, a member of the Beni Kedem Temple, Scottish Rite bodies and Washington Lodge 58 of St. Albans. And he was vice-president of the St. Albans Kiwanis Club.

And he was a Democrat, unceasing, dedicated, a Democrat involved in party projects, and a Democrat elected to public office by his peers.

He was a husband, a father, a good citizen of a growing community, a man active in public affairs.

And he was unfailingly polite, obliging, patient, friendly.

We knew Eddie over a long series of council meetings, held in city hall, year after year, and never once did he ever display ill temper or rudeness.

The City Council table is shaped like unto a huge T, and Eddie sat at the top, at the West end of that part which you might say was the bar that crossed the huge T.

Eddie was a man of good and stable emotion, a man of human laughter, and of fairness, a man of the keen enjoyment of life and the living thereof.

He devoted considerable time to the city, to the duties of being a councilman: he worked hard at being a member of the city government.

Many people knew George (Eddie) Byrnside, and all who knew him respected him as an individual, as a councilman, as a justice of the peace, as a Democrat.

He had been ill, but apparently had recovered, and then came the cruel illness he suddenly suffered on an outing, and after a week in a Huntington hospital, Eddie Byrnside passed away.

With his death, St. Albans has lost one of its most enterprising and finest, and most dedicated citizens: We all shall miss Eddie Byrnside.

He was genuine and sincere. (Once we had some trouble with Eddie about the rezoning of a street. Eddie held his ground, frankly and openly stated his position, and was completely and entirely honest about his own position and belief. You could not help but respect him.)

Thus we say goodbye, and thanks a lot, to Eddie Byrnside.

Universal Language of Music Overcomes Tensions of International Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in times of war the most conspicuous acts of excellence are often those occurring on the battlefield. But if man is ever to achieve peace, he must pursue excellence in realms of beauty and not in fields of death. Thus I view with hope and pride the achievements of Misha Dichter, a 20-year-old student from Beverly Hills, Calif., and would like to bring his achievements to the attention of my colleagues.

In the recent Third Tchaikovsky Music Competition in Moscow, Mr. Dichter was awarded second place in the piano division. The first-place winner, a Russian, was all but ignored by the audience, who gave the young American an ovation unprecedented since Van Cliburn's triumph 8 years ago. It seems that the universal language of music was able to overcome the tensions of international relations.

Misha Dichter was born in Shanghai, China, in 1945 and came to the United States with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leon Dichter, in 1948. A lifetime resident of West Los Angeles, Mr. Dichter began piano lessons at the age of 6. Throughout his elementary and secondary education, he was able to maintain good grades, participate in athletics, and still practice piano up to 8 hours a day. His first public concert was given at the University of California at Los Angeles in early 1963, where his presentation of Stravinsky's "Petrushka" won praises from music critics.

After graduation from Beverly Hills High School in June 1963, Mr. Dichter spent 1 year pursuing a full course load at UCLA and continuing his music at home under the direction of Aube Tzerko. In the fall of 1964, he was accepted at Juilliard School of Music to study piano under Rosina Lhevinne. For the past 2 years he has devoted himself to his music, and his hard work has yielded well-earned recognition in Moscow.

We of California's 26th Congressional District are proud of Mr. Dichter, as must be all Americans. Proud, not only because of his triumph in Moscow, but also because his dedication and his talent offer a reminder that the universality of art can supercede the diversity of politics. John F. Kennedy once said that he believed in the Greek definition of happiness—the full use of one's powers in pursuit of excellence. On that ground, Misha Dichter must be the happiest of men, and we congratulate him on his victory.

Federal Takeover Is Frightening

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Bristol Virginia-Tennessean, which seeks to point out the dangerous trend in our Federal Government to assume responsibilities that rightfully belong to our people.

In fact, rather than the Federal Government charging into every area of our lives, it should be demanding that the people assume their responsibilities if our Government is to continue along the lines in which it was conceived.

The editorial follows:

FEDERAL TAKEOVER IS FRIGHTENING

The constant drive to have the federal government take over more and more of the affairs of individuals and businesses is frightening. One of the most disturbing manifestations of this disposition to control is the growing agitation for laws to "protect" the consumer from the ravages of merchants and manufacturers.

If legislation is ever passed straitjacketing the marketplace and standardizing packaging, labeling, grading and merchandising methods, two results are certain: Consumers will no longer be able to control by their purchases the kind of goods they want, and the federal agency setting out to administer the legislation will be the biggest one in the government.

Commenting on this new inroad on personal affairs, James M. Patterson, director of public relations of a major oil company, says government officials are underestimating the intelligence of American women when they seek to advise homemakers on how to shop for bargains. He emphasized that, "If our state and federal governments were as good at holding down the cost of government as our women are at holding down the controllable items in the family budget, we'd have very little to worry about." It can be added that the retailers themselves are the housewives' greatest allies in seeking out bargains—that's an essential part of running a successful store. Increased effort is being directed to encouraging bargain buying.

Mr. Patterson points out that while the cost of living index has increased only 6.5 per cent in the last five years, the cost of the federal government is up 31 per cent and that of local and state government is up 45 per cent. The price of government is increasing the cost of living more than the items in the cost of living index.

"American women should demand that the cost of government be included in the cost of living index, where it can be subjected to . . . the same demands for economy and efficiency, that private individuals and corporations are subjected to." Why not?

A Needed Warning Voiced by Romney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, constantly in the spotlight at last week's National Governors conference in Los Angeles, Michigan Gov. George Romney deserves still more attention for the light he shed on problems of Federal and State governmental relationships. Decrying the erosion of the American system of cooperative federalism in the face of growing Federal domination, he invoked State governments to work for needed internal reorganization.

He suggested changes in the national tax structure to allow State and local governments a larger share in these revenues, and he suggested modifications in the form of Federal grants, rebates, and so forth. Governor Romney called for prompt judicial review of conflicts between States and Federal administrative agencies, and he proposed that the Vice President head an Office of State Relations.

As indication that Governor Romney's refreshingly constructive and thoughtful suggestions merit serious consideration, under unanimous consent I include in today's RECORD this editorial from the July 7, 1966, issue of the Lansing State Journal, entitled "A Needed Warning Voiced by Romney":

A NEEDED WARNING VOICED BY ROMNEY

In a speech Tuesday at a Town Hall luncheon in California where he is attending the National Governors conference, Gov. Romney again stressed the importance of cooperation in solving the problems and meeting the needs of the nation, the states and the local communities.

He said the American system of Cooperative Federalism—the balanced partnership between the national government and the states—has "served us well" but that today it is in crisis because the tides of change have eroded the position of the states.

"The federal government is weakening the vital principle of cooperation with the states by moving in and taking over responsibilities which properly belong at the state and local level," the Michigan governor said. "It is replacing Cooperative Federalism with a growing trend toward federal domination."

Asserting that it is right and proper for the federal government to use its superiority of money and credit to help the people meet their needs, Romney said it must act wisely, but that many of its methods are dangerously mistaken.

"America's emerging centralism masquerades under the false label of 'Creative Federalism'," the governor said. "But its supporters subscribe to a fundamental misconception.

"They assert that the federal government, rather than increasing its own power, is creating new centers of power and independent action. It is not. It is merely acquiring new administrative appendages at the state and local level to carry out its programs. It is encouraging conformity, not diversity and creativity. It is fostering compliance, not cooperation. It is centralizing power, not dispersing it."

Romney made it clear he was not talking about "some dusty dogma" of "states' rights."

"I'm talking about a job to be done," he said. "I wouldn't be in state government if I didn't believe it has an indispensable job to do . . . I know that some of those who shout the loudest about states' rights are laggards in state responsibility. They cry out against action by the national government—not because they want to act themselves, but because they don't want anybody to act at all."

Romney said that, fortunately for Cooperative Federalism, most states are doing everything they can to master change and step up to their responsibilities but that they face a serious handicap because they are running out of money under a system in which "the steeply-graduated federal income tax is bringing money into Washington hand over fist."

Unlike those who merely criticize federal policies and warn against their consequences, Romney offered some specific proposals to reverse the trend toward central domination and control:

Governors and state legislatures should redouble their efforts for fundamental organizational, fiscal and legal reform of state and local government.

The federal government should correct "the imbalance in the national tax structure which leaves the states and cities starving in the midst of plenty." Romney said this could be done by the federal government allowing certain state and local taxes to be credited against specific federal taxes; by the federal government making "bloc grants" to the states in specific program areas, without restrictive and expensive controls; by rebating federal taxes to the states on a basis of need and population, with no strings attached; or by relinquishing some federal tax sources to the states so the states could raise their own money.

The federal government should channel aid to cities through the states to make possible state-wide coordination for effective and fair use of tax dollars.

Congress should require periodic review of all federal grant programs, and permit prompt judicial review of conflicts between states and federal administration agencies.

Congress should recognize the states as partners in meeting new inter-governmental challenges.

The President should put the vice president at the head of an Office of State Relations instead of giving him the lesser responsibility for relations with the nation's cities.

As a state executive and as a possible Republican nominee for the presidency in 1968, Gov. Romney has obviously given deep thought to what he believes to be a proper relationship between the national government and the states.

We believe his suggestions deserve careful consideration by those in government at all levels.

America's best hope for the future lies in a nation of 50 strong and responsible states, not in a system in which virtually all power would be centralized in an ever growing federal government.

"Big Brother" FDA Contends It Knows Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James J. Kilpatrick's column in the Washington Star of July 10 gives substance to a remark that we frequently hear on Capitol Hill, that we are now living under a constitutionally elected tyranny.

His column follows:

"Big Brother" FDA Contends It Knows Best

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

One of the most maddening aspects of the benevolent paternalism that passes for government in the United States today is to be found in the bland process by which bureaucratic opinion takes on the force and effect of law.

The process pervades the whole of government everywhere. Racial integration is held to be an affirmative good, in schools, hospitals and housing developments; therefore, integration will be compelled or Federal funds will be withheld. Billboards are viewed as distasteful; therefore, under penalty of law, billboards must go. The government conceives some interest in the American bathroom; so the American citizen must answer all the bathroom questions on his census form, or the citizen will go to jail.

Nowhere in our government is this arrogance of power less restrained, or more abused, than in the Food and Drug Administration. Here is the pietistic face of Big Brother, solicitous but firm, looking after our waist lines. Perhaps we ought to be grateful, but how did the FDA get control of the ice box? Who says that Big Brother knows best?

Two recent incidents are typical of the FDA's obsessive drive to impose its will, by law, on everyone else.

In New York, on the complaint of the FDA, marshals recently swooped down upon the Ohsawa Foundation at 317 Second Avenue, and there confiscated a large quantity of "macrobiotic foods," and a large quantity of books and pamphlets on Zen cookery. Now, it is important to understand that the foods themselves were not contaminated in any way. They were not mislabeled. The barley flour was pure barley flour, the Azuki beans precisely as described; the roasted malt, soy sauce, rice cakes, millet seeds, and sesame oil were not adulterated in any way.

It was the ideas that were bad. The Zen philosophy holds that a certain diet is affirmatively good, and that certain of these foods will cure diseases ranging from apoplexy to trachoma. In the view of the FDA, and the FDA is doubtless right, dandelion root tea bags are not adequate and effective treatment for anemia, appendicitis, arthritis, burns, cancer, cataracts, constipation, diabetes, and so on down the line. "Such diets are dangerous," says the FDA in a press release. Four persons are known to have died in New Jersey and one in California from following the Zen precepts religiously. So the food must be seized and the books condemned.

Why? In all seriousness, why? If a relative handful of Zen Buddhists think they will make it to nirvana on soybean paste, why should the Federal government say them nay? Is this a threat to the public health of such magnitude that the very idea of Zen dieting must be routed out by writs and injunctions? And if the Federal bureaucracy has power to condemn the religious diets of the Zen cultists what of its power over the diets of orthodox Jews and Catholic monks?

The second incident is of much wider application. On June 17, the FDA laid down sweeping regulations governing the labeling and fortification of a variety of food products. Henceforth, if the FDA's edict stands up in court, a new label must appear on dietary supplements:

"Vitamins and minerals are supplied in abundant amounts by the foods we eat. The Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council recommends that dietary needs be satisfied by foods. Except for persons with special medical needs, there is no scientific basis for recommending routine use of dietary supplements."

These are plainly value judgments. These are opinions. They may be the very best opinions, but that is all they amount to. Yet under its rule-making power, the FDA proposes to transform these opinions into binding law. Nutrients may be added to certain foods "only if they have real value." Fortified foods will become illegal "if the labeling or advertising contains any statements or pictures implying that a diet of ordinary foods will not supply adequate amounts of vitamins and minerals." The FDA says flatly that "excessive amounts of vitamins and minerals cannot be used by the body." Therefore, no man may use them.

Doubtless the Food and Nutrition Board has abundant evidence to support its view. No layman is in a position to argue. But if a man "feels good" by reason of a multivitamin tablet, or thinks he "gets energy" from a fortified cereal, what business is this of Big Brother? A whole lot of therapy, as every physician knows, is entirely in the mind. Suppose vast sums of money are squandered on useless vitamin pills? Much vaster sums are squandered on bookies and blondes, in ways that may also lift the human spirit.

The most precious of all rights, Brandeis once remarked, is the right to be let alone. Someone ought to chisel that motto in stone on the portals that lead to the FDA.

Walter R. Graham, Managing Editor, the Springfield Sunday Republican, and Sports Editor of the Springfield Daily News and Sunday Republican, Retires After 43 Years of Active, Illustrious Years in Journalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Walter R. Graham, managing editor of the Springfield, Mass., Sunday Republican, and sports editor of both the Sunday Republican and the Springfield Daily News, retired on June 30 after 43 years of action-packed, illustrious, and dedicated service to the profession of journalism in western Massachusetts.

Walter Graham was a newspaperman's newspaperman of the first order, and his contributions to western Massachusetts in sports, cultural, civic, patriotic, and charitable endeavors were numerous and invaluable.

A talented writer who possessed a warm and endearing personality, Walter Graham began his newspaper career in Springfield in August 1923, as a sports writer on the Springfield Republican, then published daily and Sunday. His ability won him the sports editorship of both the Republican and the Springfield Daily News in 1930.

The Springfield Republican has been one of the most respected newspapers published in the United States. Established by Samuel Bowles as a weekly in Springfield in 1824, it began daily publication in 1844, and Sunday publication in 1878. Walter Graham succeeded to the long line of distinguished managing editors of the Republican in 1947.

Mr. Speaker, Walter Graham covered all of the major sports events in America during the past 43 years. He was known by sports writers and editors throughout the Nation. I am sure that they would want to join me in wishing this wonderful, congenial editor from Springfield the best of health and happiness in retirement. I have permission to have printed with my remarks an editorial on Walter Graham's career, and a story on his retirement by Frank B. Murray, both taken from the Springfield Sunday Republican of June 26, 1966:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, June 26, 1966]

Walter R. Graham's Career

Walter R. Graham, managing editor of The Sunday Republican since 1947, who will retire Thursday after 43 years of service on The Springfield Newspapers, has had a notable career, seldom paralleled in journalism, because it has embraced success in two distinctly different parts of the newspaper business—the sports area and the managing editorship field. Few newspapermen combine the talents necessary to perform both of these functions well, as he has done.

Mr. Graham began his local newspaper career in 1923 as a sports writer on The Republican. His ability was soon recognized and in 1930 he was chosen to be the sports editor of both The Republican and The Daily News.

As a sports writer and editor, Mr. Graham was particularly interested in promoting wholesome athletic recreations among young people. The big growth and great success of boys' baseball and hockey and other young people's sports in this region has been substantially due to his efforts and enthusiasm.

When a managing editor was needed for The Sunday Republican in 1947, Mr. Graham again was the choice. This was a big challenge, for it meant entering a part of newspaper work which to a certain extent was new to him. But his true talent for all phases of journalism was clearly shown by the entirely successful way that he took over this task. He built up and improved The Sunday Republican, maintaining its old prestige, yet adding new, improved, progressive elements. Under his direction The Sunday Republican has grown largely in size, circulation, contents, reader interest and general public service.

Not the least of Mr. Graham's achievements has been the fact that, while managing editor of The Sunday Republican, he has also continued to serve as sports editor of The Republican and The Daily News.

The Sunday Republican's sports section is widely regarded as one of the best and largest in the country, providing a breadth of general coverage that is equalled by very few papers, even the biggest.

Mr. Graham has been notably successful for several reasons: a high level of native intelligence, a natural aptitude for newspaper work, an intense devotion to the painstaking detail which is so important in this field, a good capacity for leadership, and a talent for making friends. This latter quality, based on a warm heart, an outgoing spirit, a sympathetic attitude toward all, is one which is of special value to men in newspaper management positions, for it promotes good relations with the public as well as harmony and cheerful co-operation among the paper's staff members.

Mr. Graham's deep humanity, his eagerness to help others at all times, has found further expression in his numerous valuable contributions to the improvement of community life as a whole. He has been a leader in such constructive enterprises as the United Fund and the Chamber of Commerce, and an active participant in numerous musical, educational, cultural and religious organizations.

A man of unusually pleasing personality, and gifted both as an elocutionist and a poet, Mr. Graham has been in wide demand as a speaker and toastmaster at many events in this region for a long time. His services to sports and public welfare organizations have been widely recognized, and have brought him numerous honors and trophies.

In the newspaper office, Mr. Graham has been an invigorating, constructive and stabilizing force for many years. To his desk have come countless people, from all departments, seeking advice, encouragement, assistance of one sort or another. He has received them all cordially, given generously of his time to them, solved their problems, revived their spirits, encouraged their ambitions, helped them in many ways. There is scarcely a person who has been on the local newspaper for any appreciable length of time who has not benefited, in one way or another, from these advantageous contacts with him.

So saying "goodbye" to Walter Graham—inspired leader, good friend, warm-hearted humanitarian, first-class newspaperman—is very hard to do. Yet we all know how thoroughly he has earned his retirement. No matter how much we will miss him personally, regardless of how great a gap his departure will leave in our professional group-life, irrespective of the loss that we will all inevitably suffer through his leaving, we cannot be selfish about it.

So we all wish for Walter, in the very fullest abundance, many years of complete rest, total relaxation, utmost happiness. And this wish is shared, we know, by the host of friends that he has all around the country.

Walter R. Graham To Retire Thursday as Editor of the Sunday Republican

(By Frank B. Murray)

With the publication of today's edition of The Springfield Sunday Republican, Walter R. Graham, managing editor of this newspaper and longtime sports editor of both The Republican and The Daily News, brings to an end 43 action-packed years in the general news and sports world.

SUCCEEDED BY DYKSTRA

His retirement, effective Thursday, June 30, climaxes a career that has carried him from the nation's great football stadiums, baseball parks and hockey arenas to the editor's chair of The Republican. His successor as editor of The Sunday Republican will be Roy W. Dykstra, present managing editor of The Springfield Union, himself a veteran of 40 years in the newspaper business.

The many years of Mr. Graham's newspaper work have been marked by an active dedication to public service which has embraced such community endeavors as the Joint Civic Agencies of Greater Springfield and its Breakfast Club, United Fund-Red Cross campaign committees, Citizens Action Commission, Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame, Springfield Area Development Corp. and numerous other projects undertaken over the years by churches of all creeds and organizations of every complexion.

Mr. Graham was born in Dorchester, Nov. 26, 1899, the son of Arthur F. and Annie A. Graham. He attended Boston Latin School and Newton High School and was graduated at Boston College in 1922. It was at BC where Mr. Graham groomed for his newspaper career, for in addition to coming under the college's rigid scholastic discipline, he became editor of "The Heights," the student newspaper. He also took part in dramatics as president of the BC Dramatic Club. This helped prepare him for the public speaking of which he did much in later years.

BEGAN IN COLORFUL ERA

Mr. Graham began his newspaper career in Springfield in August, 1923, under the aegis of an able sports editor, F. J. "Joe" Collins of The Republican. He started in a colorful era. Jack Dempsey was in training for his heavyweight bout with Luis Firpo, Bill Tilden was preparing to lead America's defense of the Davis Cup, and Bobby Jones was ruling the golf realm. Babe Ruth was moving to his prime and Red Grange was making headlines for Illinois in football. It was the sports period known as the Golden Twenties.

The Eastern Baseball League was going strong here in Springfield, and in all there were 21 minor leyague ball clubs in New England. The Greater Springfield area was studded with numerous first-rate semipro baseball and football teams. In basketball, the YMCA and the YMHA had potent teams.

One of the first assignments Graham received from Mr. Collins was to cover a semipro baseball game at old League (now Pynchon) Park. It was an extra exciting beginning. The North End Bridge burned down. His first by-line story was of a football game between Amherst College and its crosstown rival, the Massachusetts Agricultural College, now the University of Massachusetts. Ever since that day, Mr. Graham has had a warm spot in his heart for the small college games.

In 1930, he was selected by the late Sherman H. Bowles to become sports editor of both The Republican and The Daily News. Thus began a new phase in his newspaper career. His column, "From the Crow's Nest" in The Daily News and later in The Sunday Republican became a bible for countless thousands of sports followers. With the strong support and inspiration of Mr. Bowles, Walter stressed the organization and encouragement of schoolboy and junior sports. He has always been ready and eager to be of aid to youth's amateur sports endeavors. For his untiring work in that field, Mr. Graham has been the recipient of many awards.

Mr. Graham is a member of St. Michael's Cathedral parish and one of the original members of the Boston College Club of Western Massachusetts. He is married to the former Beatrice E. Morehouse. Their wedding took place at Newton in 1935. They make their home at 158 Maple St., Springfield.

SUNDAY EDITOR

Mr. Graham entered still another phase of his newspaper career when he was named editor of The Springfield Sunday Republican by Mr. Bowles in 1947. Now, in addition to his vast sports interests, he was to become immersed in community activity that was not closely connected with sports. It was a position that called for an acute, sensitive intelligence that could recognize the temper and feel of the community, the slow ground swells of opinion, the premonition of social changes, the subtle changes in manners, customs and thoughts.

Under Mr. Graham's guidance, The Springfield Sunday Republican advanced steadily in circulation. He gave to the paper a distinct warmth and humaneness. Under careful guidance, the paper sought to meet its main responsibility, to represent an accurate reflection of what this Greater Springfield community is like, what its people are doing and saying and thinking.

Every week, he approached the serious business of publishing a newspaper with the same meticulous attention to detail as a football coach planning for a major game. Nothing was left to chance. Everything was mapped out from start to finish, and if an emergency arose he expected his writers and editors to adapt themselves quickly, efficiently to the unanticipated, because that is the way the journalistic ball bounces.

RARE SENSITIVITY

He brought to the editor's position an unusual warmth, a rare sensitivity to the feelings of people. This is perhaps his most noticeable characteristic. Another was his rollicking sense of humor, his explosive laughter. Another still was his deep sense of responsibility to those working with him and for him, and for people in general, particularly those down in their luck.

Seldom was he able to walk the length of Main St. without being halted in his tracks at least 30 times by friends. He never was able to finish lunch without such interruptions. And while this might have bothered a lesser man, Walter seemed always deeply interested in the trials and tribulations of almost everyone he knew.

MUCH IN DEMAND

His services were demanded by such community organizations as the old Chamber of Commerce and its successor, the Joint Civic Agencies. He became a Chamber director in 1961 and served two terms, in 1962 and 1963, as its vice-president. In 1955 he took over what was to become one of his pet community ventures, the JCA Breakfast Club. He labored long and hard in the Breakfast Club vineyard and in the nine years when he was its chairman it became one of the leading community activities, an informal gathering of the community's top business leaders.

When the Citizens Action Committee was organized in 1958, by the then Mayor Thomas J. O'Connor, Graham became its chairman of public relations. The United Fund-Red Cross appointed him to a similar task. But in addition scores of other organizations sought his help which, busy as he was, he always gave willingly. It might have been a small church group seeking help to pay off the mortgage. It might be a drive for a new hospital, a new school. It might be a fraternal organization, or a Legion outfit. Whichever it was, it came to Walter Graham.

DEMANDS EXHAUSTIVE

Graham is one of Springfield's best known newspapermen, and among its best-loved, because of this characteristic of warm and human understanding, but his reputation also widened because of his speaking ability. He became much in demand as a public speaker and master of ceremonies. The demands in time became exhaustive, but while he still had his health he accepted them. Here again the people discovered another facet in the Graham character. His research was meticulous and vast, so that when he took over as a master of ceremonies he knew almost more about the people he was to introduce than they knew themselves. His was a highly professional, competent job.

WORK TAKES ITS TOLL

Devotion to what he accepted as his public responsibility as an editor, a task that kept him busy from early morning until very late at night, eventually took its toll. He suffered a heart attack in the winter of 1964 and was confined to Springfield Hospital, and then at home, for six months.

But in time he was back at work again. He jumped into the mainstream of the news, and even some of the gatherings. In February 1965 he was called to the University of Massachusetts to accept the 25th Harold M. "Kid" Gore Award for his 42 years service to schoolboy basketball. In the following April, 500 figures from virtually all walks of life joined with amateur sports leaders in the Springfield College Field House to formally recognize his long and conscientious service to this community. He received a silver Paul Revere bowl from Gov. John A. Volpe, a portrait painted by Reggie Therrien, a plaque from Romeo J. Cyr, coordinator of PeeWee baseball, a Parks and School Committeeman, and a portfolio containing scores of testimonials from schools and organizations.

FITTING ACCOLADE

It was here that Graham received an accolade that best sums up his 43-year newspaper career. Dr. Edward S. Steitz, director of athletics of Springfield College, the principal speaker, said, in the name of all present, and the four western counties:

"We honor Walter Graham for upholding a set of principles . . . his truly outstanding work and distinguished service and his fight for the elimination of discrimination by reason of race or creed. His reputation as a fearless fighter for the good of the people of this community as well as his own staff, have marked Walter Graham as one of the finest editors in the country."

Next Thursday night promptly at 6 when Walter Graham, tanned, impeccably groomed as usual, turns the key of his office on the second floor of the newspaper building at 32 Cypress St. a personable, competent intelligent gentleman who practiced a high art, and an honorable one, will lock the door on a distinguished newspaper career.

Those of us who remain . . . we who worked with Walter Graham for the last quarter of a century or more . . . will know down deep in our hearts that the place will never quite be the same again.

Something good will be leaving the newspaper business.

Wealth of Data Richly Rewarding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I stressed the value of reports and documents prepared by congressional sources. Since then I find that my comments have been underlined by Prof. Benjamin E. Lippincott, of the University of Minnesota, in his book "Democracy's Dilemma, the Totalitarian Party in a Free Society," in which Dr. Lippincott uses materials available from the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate.

Dr. Lippincott states that in this material he found "a wealth of data that was most useful in understanding Communist activity, personnel, and organization in the United States."

He also states:

> It is the author's experience that until late years liberals have made little use of the hearings and reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate. The author found, for example, that hearing after hearing and report after report in the libraries of two great universities, Harvard and Minnesota, had never been opened.

This is indeed a sad comment on those who could use the committee's public information, as Dr. Lippincott did in researching his book.

I believe it should be stressed that these materials are available from the House committee and the Senate subcommittee.

Dr. Lippincott is professor of political science at the University of Minnesota and past vice president of the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy. In addition to being the author of several other books, he is a former teacher of Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY who praised the work in a review written for the Washington Post.

While his comments on the chairmanship of Martin Dies and Parnell Thomas are open to question, his statements generally show the quality of the valuable information available from these committees. I therefore insert these comments in the RECORD at this point.

[From Democracy's Dilemma, The Totalitarian Party in a Free Society]

A NOTE ON SOURCE MATERIALS

(By Benjamin E. Lippincott, University of Minnesota)

A comment may be of interest on source materials provided by Congressional committees, which was useful for Chapter 2. The author approached, at the outset of this study, the hearings and the reports of the Congressional investigating committees with considerable misgivings, but was surprised to find a wealth of data that was most useful in understanding Communist activity, personnel, and organization in the United States. These sources, obviously, must be used with discrimination, but anyone who is knowledgeable with respect to the Communist movement, especially if he has had direct experience with it, will find the reports and hearings richly rewarding.

It is the author's experience that until late years liberals have made little use of the hearings and reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate. The author found, for example, that hearing after hearing and report after report in the libraries of two great universities, Harvard and Minnesota, had never been opened.

The materials turned up through investigation were apparently avoided because of the excesses of Martin Dies and Parnell Thomas, the early chairmen of the House Un-American Activities Committee.[4] Part of this reputation springs from the fact that on occasion witnesses were abused, but as a rule this did not happen unless the witness was arrogant and insulting to the Committee. Part of this reputation also springs from the liberal press emphasizing the violations of fair play by the Committee, minimizing the provocative behavior of witnesses and giving little attention to the data that were developed. The Committee's reputation doubtless suffered, too, from the concerted attacks made upon it by Communists and fellow travelers.[5]

It may be remarked, in passing, that liberals who were quick to raise their voices in protest against the excesses of investigating committees dealing with Communists were on the whole notably silent with respect to the excesses of such committees dealing with the misdoings of bankers and capitalists in the twenties and early thirties. The studies made in recent years on communism in the United States under the auspices of The Fund for the Republic are correcting this lapse with respect to the use of materials in the reports and hearings of Congressional investigating committees.

---

[4] For the criticism of the House Committee, see Robert H. Carr, *The House Un-American Activities Committee: 1945–1950* (Reinhart, New York, 1951). For a defense see, William F. Buckley, Jr., *The Committee and Its Critics* (Putnam, New York, 1962). The last chapter, "A Record of the Committee's Work," lists the various hearings, reports, and consultations undertaken by the Committee. See pp. 276–335. Anyone who would attempt to understand the character and the extent of the Communist activities in the United States cannot afford to neglect these materials.

[5] The ability of a pro-Communist minority to discredit the House Un-American Activities Committee was strikingly illustrated, during the latter part of 1939 and early 1940, at the Board of Directors level of the American Civil Liberties Union. The Board had appointed the Wise Committee to investigate the HUAC under the chairmanship of Martin Dies. The Wise Committee's conclusions were mixed, although they were very critical of HUAC's methods, they said that much in the Dies findings was of value as an aid in legislating and in preparing a more adequate national defense. After the pro-Communists went to work on the conclusions, the value was insignificant. See Joseph Tanenhaus, "American Civil Liberties Union," to be published in *Studies in Infiltration: The Strategy and Tactics of Communist Maneuver* (Cornell University, Ithaca, 1965), edited by John P. Roche, a volume in the Fund for the Republic series.

Radio Station KLOL in Lincoln, Nebr., Honors Vietnam Units

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 4, 1966, KLOL radio in Lincoln, Nebr., devoted the entire broadcast day to saluting officers and men of the U.S.S. *Tortuga* and the armed helicopter detachment, Sea Wolf, of the 145th Aviation Battalion, operating from the flight deck of the *Tortuga*, both serving with the 7th Fleet along the coast of Vietnam. This special broadcast was recorded and rushed to the U.S.S. *Tortuga* and played back over the ship's public address system.

The *Tortuga*, a specialized Navy ship equipped with a flight and well deck, is stationed in the maze of river mouths where the Mekong River meets the South China Sea east of Saigon. The *Tortuga*, along with Sea Wolf, assists Vietnamese forces in the control of Communist river traffic.

All of the officers and men of the *Tortuga* and Sea Wolf were individually recognized during KLOL's special July 4 broadcast with many of the midwesterners receiving specially recorded messages from home. Officials of the various branches of the armed services and State and local government personalities also participated in this special recognition.

We, the people of Nebraska, invite all Americans to join us in paying tribute to the gallant men who represent our armed forces in war-torn Vietnam.

Community of Atlantic Democracies Advocated by National Planning Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last month the National Planning Association released a report entitled "Strengthening of the Free World Through Steps Toward Atlantic Unification" which urges the establishment of an Atlantic "community of democracies" as one proposal leading to a more secure international order.

Such an Atlantic community could evolve from present forms of cooperation to increased supranational sovereignty, common defense and foreign policies, and eventual economic integration. The community could eventually be open to democracies of the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of Atlantic cooperation and the large number of Senate and House resolutions calling for the establishment of an Atlantic union declaration to attend a convention of Atlantic nations, I offer for the RECORD the following story by Joseph Sterne, in the Baltimore Sun of May 30, 1966:

PANEL URGES COMMUNITY OF DEMOCRACIES: STATE DEPARTMENT HELD SLOW TO FACE NEED FOR LARGER UNITY

(By Joseph R. L. Sterne)

WASHINGTON, May 29.—North American and European countries were urged today to give up part of their national sovereignty in building an Atlantic community that eventually could grow into a worldwide "community of democracies."

The National Planning Association said Americans—and the State Department—have been too slow in facing up to the positive requirements needed in the construction of a more secure order.

This group of influential leaders in business, labor, agriculture and the professions contended that the Atlantic nations must be prepared to create a common organization that could integrate their foreign and defense policies.

NO VETO POWER

Following a pattern established by the six-nation European Common Market, decisions could be made on the basis of a "weighted vote" that, in effect, would deny the United States the veto power it now holds in the United Naions and NATO.

A the outset, the proposed Atlanic Community Organization would have the powers necessary to raise appropriations to carry out foreign and defense policies.

Economic integration and the knotty problem of freedom of migration, would come later, under the National Planning Association formula.

In addition, the Atlantic community would not be an exclusive "club." As conditions permit and agreement is reached, democracies in Africa, Asia and Latin America would be added.

FEDERAL PATTERN

The association said the proposed international organization shouid be based upon the Federal pattern followed when the thirteen American colonies formed the United States.

Certain powers now exercised by the individual nation-states would be delegated to the "community," an agency with supranational powers.

In a report entitled "Strengthening the Free World through Steps toward Atlantic Unification," the N.P.A. board and its standing committees argued that the "limitations" of the nation-state are obvious in a world threatened by nuclear weapons.

MORE "EVOLUTION" NEEDED

The United Nations and NATO were expressions of a growing trend toward "interdependence" and "community," it said, but more "evolution" is needed.

"Along with the feeling of loyalty Americans have always had toward their city or town, their state and their country, they will have to develop an additional loyalty toward a larger political entity," said the report.

For the people of the United States, however, the price will not be paid in the loss of their sovereignty. In a democracy, sovereignty is the possession of its citizens: the governments they create are only their agents. . . .

"The sovereign citizens of a democracy can entrust certain functions to entities other than national governments without 'sacrificing' or 'losing' any of the sovereignty they possess.

"They lose nothing, and may gain much, by delegating powers to a new agent when the existing agency cannot adequately serve their interests in peace, freedom and economic welfare."

The National Planning Association said an integrated Atlantic community could be created "around" France if President Charles de Gaulle continues his nationalistic policies.

Once Europe and North America are united, it said, there will be a sufficient concentration of military power to secure peace and a sufficient concentration of economic strength to bring real improvements in the living standards of less developed nations.

At a press conference last week in which today's report was discussed in advance of publication, top officials of the N.P.A. expressed disappointment over the State Department's attitude toward Atlantic community.

Elmo Roper, the public opinion expert and a member of the association's board, summarized the department's attitude as: "It's a fine idea, but not now."

Roper noted that Senate support for the concept is rising.

In 1946, only the late Estes Kefauver favored the community idea. Now, he said, Senators GORE (D., Tenn.), CASE (R., N.J.), COOPER (R., Ky.), MCGEE (D., Wyo.), CHURCH (D., Idaho), KUCHEL (R., Cal.), JAVITS (R., N.Y.), MCCARTHY (D., Minn.) and others support bills pending before Congress.

Ground-Breaking Ceremony for Cleveland Transit System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 30, 1966, it was our privilege in the city of Cleveland, Ohio, to break ground for the Cleveland transit system's extension to the Cleveland Hopkins International Airport.

This was an epic making event in Cleveland, which was made possible by a grant of $6,995,000 from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for half the project cost. If the community completes a comprehensive land use study within 3 years, the Federal Government has committed itself to donate an additional $2,250,000 for the project.

Additionally, the voters of Cleveland and Cuyahoga County have approved bond issues to finance parking lots and bridges in order to develop the transit extension. Cuyahoga County will spend an estimated $3.7 million on the project by providing five bridges along the rapid transit extension.

This extension of the Cleveland rapid transit system will make Cleveland the first city in the United States to have a rapid transit line serving the downtown area and the airport. This will make the Cleveland airport only minutes away from hundreds of thousands of greater Clevelanders.

It was our privilege to have the Honorable Robert Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, signal this transit achievement which was made possible under Federal law. Following is the statement of Secretary Weaver:

REMARKS AT CLEVELAND TRANSIT SYSTEM GROUND-BREAKING BY ROBERT C. WEAVER, SECRETARY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

I am doing a lot of business these days with Mayor Locher and the City of Cleveland.

The Mayor and I met in Washington early this month to announce a joint agreement between the city and the Department of Housing and Urban Development on an immediate action program to speed up Cleveland's urban renewal program.

We met again at the Conference of Mayors in Dallas in mid-June when I urged the Mayors to give strong support to our major 1966 legislative proposal—the Demonstration Cities Act. The Conference did endorse the proposal, and the House Banking and Currency Committee this week reported out an excellent bill.

This kind of cooperative action is increasing as we gear ourselves to meet the increasingly complex problems of urban areas and to the kind of coordination required to meet these problems.

President Johnson has characterized this as Creative Federalism, which he defines as follows:

"Many of our critical new programs involve the Federal Government in joint ventures with State and local governments in thousands of communities throughout the Nation. The success or failure of these programs depends on timely and effective communication and on readiness for action on the part of both Federal agencies in the field and the State and local governmental units."

We meet again today in a test of this new partnership. We are celebrating the ground breaking for an extension of the Transit System's line to this great international airport. This extension is possible because of a $6,995,000 grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The City is investing a considerable sum in parking lots at two new rapid transit stations and for an access roadway to the airport lots. And Cuyahoga County will make a considerable contribution by providing five bridges along the rapid transit extension.

This is Creative Federalism at work in the most practical way, activating the city, its transit system, the county and the Federal Government in a constructive and effective joint venture.

This expansion is an example of good planning and imaginative thinking. If I have read my facts correctly, you will have this combination:

The first modern rapid transit line in the nation serving both the downtown area and the airport;

Attractive and comfortable high-speed trains;

A convenient access road to airport parking lots;

Good parking facilities at transit terminals to lure the driver from the highway;

Loading platforms at transit terminals to accommodate feeder bus lines and what you describe as "kiss-n-ride" passengers.

It sounds to me as though you are instigating a lively flirtation between your customers and your transit system. You have my congratulations. I hope it leads to a compatible marriage.

I would also like to indulge myself in pointing with pride to our Federal achievements in this field.

The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 was characterized by President Johnson as "one of the most profoundly significant domestic measures to be enacted by the Congress during the 1960's." It is already living up to its promise.

The Congress authorized $375 million for grant assistance to cover a three-year period. The largest outlays have been for capital improvement grants for equipment and facilitities, as in the Cleveland Transit System extension.

Let me report briefly where we stand at the end of this fiscal year:

There have been 35 capital grants approved for a Federal commitment of about $133.7 million;

These have gone to communities of all sizes, in every part of the country. The smallest was about $49,000 to Kenner, Louisiana—population 17,000—for two busses and a garage. The largest was more than $23.4 million to the City of New York for 400 new cars for the subway system;

Some of these grants have prevented a breakdown or total loss of public transportation service;

The capital projects approved to date will generate an estimated $243 million in manufacturing and construction work in the transportation industry over the next two to three years, so there is a sizeable contribution to the economy;

There have been 43 grants for research, development, and demonstration projects—for a total Federal commitment of $38.4 million. These have ranged from a project to test an air cushion vehicle (known as a hovercraft) in San Francisco Bay, to one in Massachusetts which led to a reorganized metropolitan transit system.

Since a key requirement is that of planning, the Federal grant program has been a major factor in creating coordinated urban transportation systems as part of the planned development of whole metropolitan areas. This, in the future, may turn out to be our most important contribution.

All these projects have been developed locally, with the Federal involvement restricted to assistance and incentives. The fundamental concepts in this program are local initiative, local responsibility and local control.

Having passed out congratulations, I must now take a moment to view with alarm.

We have barely started the arduous journey to rebuild and revitalize our urban mass transportation systems. It is a strange combination of events indeed when we realize that while the number of people in urban America has doubled in forty years, railway commuting has been cut in half and travel by rapid transit has declined by millions of customer rides each year. As a matter of fact, transit riding is less in 1966 than it was in 1907.

We must orchestrate all the transportation facilities of whole metropolitan complexes—highways, subways, surface rail systems, and water transportation if necessary. We must coordinate these systems into the whole urban scheme of things, so that transportation doesn't tear the physical and social fabric of the community.

We must recognize, in short, that transportation must help create the urban environment we seek; that the principal problem of the city is not how to move, but how to live. In this effort, our new Department intends to move forward vigorously and effectively. We, too, have barely started our journey to help create viable and attractive urban transportation systems. We must accelerate—together—toward the future.

Feeding the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, protein deficiency is a major element of malnutrition that must be fought. Cooperation between the U.S. Government and the U.S. food industry on this problem has begun and deserves our support. The consequence of this cooperation can only be a step forward in the war on hunger.

Since increased food production is difficult and at best a future hope, and since malnutrition is an immediate and growing problem, improved diets supplemented by high-protein concentrates such as those now being developed from fish and by commercial products like Incaparina made by Quaker Oats are a major frontier in the fight.

The article that follows from the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, July 6, 1966, concisely presents some of the latest work being done to combat malnutrition on the level of improved diets. The article is well worth the attention of my colleagues; the efforts described here as well as all efforts to fight hunger on all possible levels are commendable and must be supported. The problem of world hunger is our problem. We have the means to solve it. We must get on with the task.

The article follows:

Feeding the World: Firms, United States Plan Fight on Protein Deficiency in Impoverished Lands—Fast Rise in Living Standards Seen if Disease Is Halted—Mass Test Slated in India—Quaker Oats Aids Colombians

(By Burt Schorr)

Washington.—Malnutrition afflicts an estimated 350 million children, or 70% of the world's population under the age of six. Half of its victims probably will die before they are grown; the remainder may be marked for life by stunted physical and mental development.

Malnutrition is no stranger to history. In recent years, however, medical men have begun to recognize one of its forms as a particular menace to world health. Its name: Kwashiorkor—or, less exotically, protein deprivation.

If its debilitating grip can be loosened, living standards in impoverished lands might begin to rise with surprising speed. Overcome kwashiorkor, U.S. foreign aid officials say, and the food and population pinch which confronts poor lands like India could ease sharply. Their reasoning: A healthier, more alert populace could work harder and more effectively to feed itself; mothers, given hope that their babies might live beyond childhood, might become more receptive to birth control appeals. U.S. planners caution, however, that because protein deficiency is deeply rooted in regional food customs and national poverty, its remedy won't be simple or swift.

WORLD-WIDE ASSAULT

Even so, U.S. Government hunger-fighters are assigning a high priority to the first world-wide assault on kwashiorkor, now being planned. Their efforts have the enthusiastic backing of President Johnson; the Administration's "food for freedom" bill, now nearing final action by Congress, is expected to provide encouragement by shifting U.S. food aid aims further from the surplus disposal of past years to filling specific diet deficiencies of hungry lands.

Barring some hitch, the Agency for International Development and the Agriculture Department hope by the year-end to begin a massive pilot program, probably in India, distributing wheat whose protein quality has been significantly improved by the addition of a special compound. Up to 1 million tons of the grain and as many as a million persons may be involved. The goal is to show the benefit of adequate protein intake in actual human diets—far from the laboratory.

The Government also is turning to a possibly powerful kwashiorkor weapon that has been left almost idle during two decades of foreign aid: The U.S. food industry.

In a few months AID officials expect to begin granting indirect subsidies, probably in the form of wheat, corn and other commodities, to support marketing abroad of locally adapted protein foods by overseas subsidiaries of U.S. food and chemical companies, probably including General Foods Corp. and Quaker Oats Co. More liberal use of AID's extended risk guarantee program, which offers reimbursement for losses ranging up to 75% of capital investments, is expected to encourage American companies' outlays for plant and equipment to produce protein food in hungry lands with shaky economies. Profits aren't the prime aim; but participating firms could well discover that the new protein drive has exposed their brand-name products to millions of potential new customers.

UNITED STATES FEEDS 500 MILLION

Since World War II Uncle Sam has given away or sold on long-term credit more than $14 billion of foodstuffs, and U.S. aid currently is helping to feed some 500 million persons around the world. "But we've always avoided using brand-name products," notes Herbert J. Waters, head of AID's Office of Material Resources. "Now we want to escape the stigma of charity donations and at the same time build up local food processing on a country-by-country basis." Adding urgency to AID's efforts is the fact that surplus stocks of dry milk, heretofore the prime source of proteins for U.S.-aided foreign diets, have been cleaned out, and the climbing free-market cost of milk rules out heavy purchases by the Government for shipment abroad.

The complex interplay of diet deficiencies that comprise general malnutrition still is only partly understood by nutritionists. But this much is known: The body needs more than 20 amino acids to build the proteins essential for bone and tissue growth and maintenance. Given an adequate diet, it can produce all but 9 of the acids itself; the others it must obtain from animal or vegetable protein sources.

Where undernourishment—or hunger for food of any quality—is the problem, though, it's probably useless to increase protein intake; rather than building up its supply, the body will consume protein as calories until calorie needs are met. Even a combined improvement of protein-calorie intake can precipitate vitamin A deficiencies in children, causing impaired vision or total blindness—a problem that developed in Brazil before vitamin A was added to U.S.-donated powdered milk.

IMPACT ON CHILDREN

There's increasing evidence, all the same, that kwashiorkor is the single, most important element of malnutrition. Studies repeatedly have shown that in protein-poor regions such as Central America and southern India, rice, corn, bananas and other high-carbohydrate foods commonly consumed help provide a certain minimum amount of essential protein for adults, yet often fail to do so for children whose protein needs are far greater.

Kwashiorkor, in fact, is originally a Ghanian expression used to describe the poor health of toddlers recently weaned from mother's milk, a source of high-quality protein. Freely translated, it means "the sickness the older baby gets when the new baby comes." In Guatemala, mothers often stop nursing infants when they are about six months old, an age when they require some three times as much high-quality protein per pound of body weight as the average adult. Even at two years, the weaning age in some parts of central Africa, a child needs about one and a half times the proportion of protein adequate for an adult.

Kwashiorkor victims suffer stunted growth, diarrhea, swollen tissue and hair discoloration; often they die from measles, chicken pox and other childhood diseases that otherwise wouldn't be fatal. Recent studies of afflicted youngsters in Mexico seem to show permanent damage to the central nervous system.

"The listlessness and apathy of some people in underdeveloped countries may be in direct consequence of infantile protein malnutrition," theorizes Max Milner, an AID biochemist.

Some nutritionists, concerned that lifesaving protein nourishment will cause a sudden population bulge in already-crowded regions of the globe, warn that birth control measures must grow apace. Aaron M. Altschul, who heads the Agriculture Department's share of the anti-kwashiorkor campaign, doesn't disagree but contends that better diet actually will "reduce population pressure in countries like Libya where a mother must give birth to five sons in order to have one live to support her in her old age." Mr. Altschul also argues that sufficient protein intake is essential if farmers abroad are to be healthy and alert enough to adopt needed agricultural techniques like intensive fertilizer use.

COUNTING ON CEREALS

As diet-conscious Americans know, meat, milk and eggs offer high concentrations of protein. But because of the needed investments in feed, processing equipment or both, only the wealthier nations can afford them in the quantities needed to make inroads against kwashiorkor. (The average U.S. diet provides about 90 grams of protein daily, 70% derived from animal sources; in Pakistan, protein intake averages a skimpy 45 grams, only 12% of it from animal sources.) So U.S. planners are counting on common cereals like wheat, corn and rice, all diet mainstays in kwashiorkor-affected regions, to provide the needed protein.

Such cereals contain the nine essential amino acids; but because one of them, lysine, is present in too small quantities naturally, the utilization of the other eight is limited. So the needed amount must be added. Lysine, a nitrogen compound produced by a fermentation process, already is used to provide the "high protein" content of certain breads and breakfast foods sold in this country; it can do much the same for national dishes abroad. Though lysine-reinforced wheat can't match milk or meat for protein quality, it comes close to protein standards established by the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization.

Government nutrition planners hope the mass test with protein-supplemented wheat in India will provide the first definite information about its benefits in actual human diets.

Initially, the experiment will employ U.S.-milled wheat flour to which lysine as well as calcium and vitamins have been added. Distribution would be confined to one or more Indian cities where U.S. flour already is being consumed—usually in the form of chapatis, India's traditional hand-shaped patty. Later on, unmilled wheat would be used, possibly by mixing with it supplementation capsules shaped and colored to resemble wheat kernals. This wheat would be shipped to isolated interior villages for grinding into flour.

MEASUREMENTS PLANNED

"From the standpoint of food research, India is an advanced country," says an AID nutritionist. "With the help of local technologists, we'll be able to get precise measurements for the first time on weight gains, tissue changes and other biochemical results in defined groups of people eating supplemented and non-supplemented wheat."

Successful wheat supplementation obviously would cause a sharp jump in lysine production. Merck & Co., Inc., and a Japanese concern now are believed to account for nearly all the world's estimated annual output of 12 million pounds. Judging by prospective supplementation of the approximately 16 million tons of wheat yearly the U.S. is shipping to foreign aid recipients, demand for this amino acid eventually could zoom as high as 90 million pounds annually. Besides Merck, several major U.S. chemical companies, including FMC Corp. and Union Carbide Corp., have indicated interest in supplying the additional lysine needed.

High-ranking executives of 10 leading U.S. food companies, for their part, pledged their support of the protein drive at a meeting with AID and Agriculture Department officials at Harvard Business School last month. A number of the conference participants already are surveying prospects for launching low-cost protein products in needy areas. General Foods is considering marketing in a Latin American country a blended food that would include its patented fish flour.

Quaker Oats, however, seems first in line for receiving Government help in the protein push. For the past three years, a Colombian subsidiary, Productos Quaker, S.A., has been marketing Incaparina, a blend of corn, cottonseed and soybean flours plus yeast, calcium carbonate and vitamin A. Government officials view the effort as a model for other American companies and are eager to support it.

TEST IN GUATEMALA

The Incaparina formula is one of several cereal blends developed by the Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama (INCAP). The cottonseed and soybean flours themselves are rich in the essential amino acids and also provide extra lysine to unlock the corn protein. A test in Guatemala showed that 75 grams of Incaparina daily raised average protein intake for children two to three years old from less than 60% of the recommended level to 110%.

Like corn meal, which it resembles, Incaparina can be used to make colada, the traditional thin gruel of Colombia, as well as other dishes calling for corn. It's quite a bargain too; one glass costing only one-third of a U.S. cent matches the nutritional value of five-cents-a-glass powdered milk.

So far, though, Colombians are buying only half the 2,000 tons of Incaparina Quaker Oats figures it must sell annually to repay its investment and yield a modest profit.

"We've distributed samples at health centers, and made heavy use of radio and sound-truck advertisements," says A. J. Dimino, the company's vice president for Latin America. "Most of the people willing to try it become customers. But at the lowest economic and educational levels we're trying to reach, it's very difficult to change food habits even enough to accept a free sample." Such an experience with a nutritious food that undernourished people refuse to buy is common in less-developed regions of the world.

Quaker Oats believes that with $150,000 a year in AID assistance over a three-year period, it could boost Incaparina sales in Colombia to profitable levels and perhaps as high as 5,000 tons yearly. Assuming the Colombian government agrees, AID officials envision donating soybean and cottonseed flour to Colombia in amounts equivalent to the annual dollar figure requested by Quaker Oats. The Latin country in turn would sell the commodities to Productos Quaker for pesos which would be set aside for further promotion efforts and for purchases of Incaparina for free distribution to schools, hospitals and villages.

Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in my district at 55 Fifth Avenue we have the Ferkauf Graduate School of Education of Yeshiva University.

Recently they announced at a symposium-convocation the establishment of Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences.

At the convocation, President Samuel Belkin states that the next 2 years would be devoted to selecting distinguished department chairmen and an outstanding faculty, with the first student to be admitted for the 1968–69 academic year. Concentrating its programs for doctoral level students, the school will offer programs in three broad areas of inquiry: education, behavioral and social sciences, and liberal arts.

Dean Joshua A. Fishman outlined the goals of the new graduate school in an address delivered on March 21, 1966, at the symposium-convocation.

I commend it to my colleagues:

A New Departure in American Graduate Education

(Address delivered by Dr. Joshua A. Fishman, dean, FGSE, March 21, 1966, at symposium-convocation marking establishment of Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences)

I am privileged to address you in two different capacities this afternoon: first, as dean of Ferkauf Graduate School of Education and, secondly, as chairman of the Interdivisional Planning Committee, consisting of faculty and administration representatives, for planning a new graduate school of humanities and social sciences at Yeshiva University.

For Ferkauf Graduate School of Education the expansion into a full-fledged graduate school of humanities and social sciences signals a vast improvement in the ability to develop in the very direction that the School first adopted six years ago, that is, in the direction of cross-disciplinary research and multi-disciplinary theory on human behavior. Even as a graduate school of education it did not seem possible or desirable for us to emphasize teacher training, in view of the dearth of reliable knowledge about how children learn and how teachers influence such learning. As a result, Ferkhauf Graduate School of Education began to specialize more and more in conducting research and in preparing research specialists concerned with matters one or two or even three steps distant from the actual classroom confrontation between pupils and teachers. To borrow a phrase from another field, we decided to cut back the production of consumer goods and to invest in basic productive capacity instead.

NEED FOR INTERACTION

However, the more we came to stress basic knowledge about man and mankind—and to do so across the board—not only in psychology, where it is commonplace to do so, but also in guidance, in special education, in administration, and in other fields of more immediate traditional relevance to education, the more we came to realize that our goal was substantially beyond our grasp, given the limited range of disciplinary competences and interests traditionally located within even the most illustrious graduate schools of education. For effective work of the kind and the caliber that we have been pursuing and seeking to pursue we have had a need for interaction, on the part of faculty and students alike, with sociology and philosophy, with history and literature, with linguists and political science, with anthropology and economics.

Indeed, we required at our level, at the graduate level, the same kind of broadening and deepening that has resulted in the expansion of hundreds of undergraduate teachers' colleges into general colleges of liberal arts and sciences.

What we requested was the recognition that at the graduate level, too, teacher education is much more than simply another professional endeavor. It is first and foremost an intellectual endeavor striving to increase knowledge about man and the processes whereby he learns, grows, changes, and influences others.

The University's decision to expand our school into the entire domain of the humanities and the social sciences could not be more welcomed than it is by the faculty and administration of Ferkauf Graduate School of Education. It is, for us, a dream come true, the flowering of a seed planted several years ago and nourished by hard work and considerable sacrifice. We are grateful to the University, to its President, and to the Board of Trustees for taking this momentous step. We are sure that our gratitude will be matched by the increased stature of our work at the University, as well as by the increased stature of our University among the centers of higher learning. We hope that the detailed planning of the precise structure and operation of the expanded school will now continue with increased involvement and increased momentum so that the first fruits of these plans and of today's convocation will not be far off.

As chairman of the Interdivisional Committee appointd in 1965 to prepare a statement of general guidelines for a new graduate school of humanities and social sciences at Yeshiva University, I would now like to read a few of the introductory paragraphs from our preliminary report which has been submitted to and generally accepted by the President and Board of Trustees in January of this year.

PRIMARY GOAL

The primary goal of Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences is to further extend and transmit knowledge bearing upon the humanities and social sciences by the conduct of exemplary graduate-level research and training. For this purpose the School brings together scholars and students from a variety of disciplines, running the gamut from the theoretical to the applied and from the empirical to the philosophical, so that while pursuing their own specializations and priorities they may, nevertheless, more easily interact to their own mutual stimulation and to the benefit of all who are dedicated to the humanities and the social sciences.

Yeshiva University realizes that a single graduate school including sociology and phychology, special education and guidance, literature and art under one roof is a relatively new departure in American graduate education. However, this approach is certainly no more revolutionary than that which long ago brought together the liberal arts and the natural sciences in one institution at the graduate level, or that which brought together the applied and the pure health sciences in medical colleges, or that which brought together the humanities, the physical sciences, and the behavioral sciences in undergraduate colleges throughout the modern world. Thus, the primary goal of Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences is not revolutionary, but, rather, facilitory. By facilitating the interaction of scholars and students in a wide variety of humanities and social science fields the University seeks to promote greater familiarity and respect for the different but often complementary approaches and emphases that these fields represent.

AREAS OF JEWISH STUDY

Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences provides opportunities for interested faculty and students to extend and transmit knowledge in areas of Jewish study related to the domains of inquiry and instruction established at the School.

A further goal of Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences is that of service to the University. The University's undergraduate colleges and its other graduate schools recognize the importance of the humanities and social sciences for their own academic and professional programs. Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences seeks to strengthen teaching and research in its areas of specialization at the other units of the University by various means, including joint faculty appointments, formal vertical integration between departments, joint conferences and projects, etc. Most faculty members appointed to the new school will teach from time to time at the undergraduate level.

GREATER INTERACTION

Most basically, however, the University hopes that interdisciplinary problems of modern life and of modern thought may be more frequently and soundly tackled as a byproduct of the facilitation of greater interaction between students and scholars who have hitherto normally been physically separated from each other and whom Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences seeks to bring together under one roof. Nevertheless, the University realizes that interdisciplinary progress must rest on strong disciplinary foundations. As a result, the University undertakes to initiate and maintain strong disciplinary work at Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences while leaving to the faculty of the School the establishment of as many interdisciplinary channels and pursuits as are feasible and productive.

Mr. President, we are ready for graduate work in the humanities and in the social sciences to begin in earnest at Yeshiva University.

Fraser Survey Finds Public Opinion Divided on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. FRASER. In May, Mr. Speaker, I distributed a questionnaire among my constituents on some of the critical issues facing our Nation. Paramount among these issues is the Vietnam war. For this reason a question on Vietnam headed the list of 15 topics covered by my questionnaire.

The answers reflected the divided opinion of our Nation toward the conflict. Three choices were offered: Withdrawal of American forces, increases military activities or continuation of our present limited involvement while seeking avenues for negotiation. None of the three choices attracted a majority. A plurality of 42 percent favored continuation of our present policy. Military acceleration was favored by 30 percent, and 28 percent supported withdrawal.

WIDE DISTRIBUTION

More than 150,000 questionnaires were mailed out—one to every household in the city of Minneapolis—to Minnesota's Fifth Congressional District, which I represent.

Some 5,300 were returned. This is a sizable response, considering that the questionnaires were printed on the back of a newsletter and had to be torn off and put in an envelope by the recipients. I realize that a separate questionnaire would have produced a larger response, but the combined mailing was made to save money. The cost of printing the questionnaire was paid with my own funds, not with tax money.

The response to the questionnaire has demonstrated, above all else, that the people of Minneapolis are aware of and concerned about the problems with which we in Congress struggle every day.

POLLUTION

The greatest majority of all—88 percent—expressed concern over our increasingly polluted air and water by favoring Federal action to control pollution. The next most popular issues were truth-in-packaging and truth-in-lending bills, with 86 percent in favor.

CONTRIBUTIONS

Only one question drew a predominantly negative response. This was the question concerning tax relief for persons who make small political contributions. More than 60 percent of the respondents said no.

RHODESIA

Relatively small numbers of "undecided" answers to most questions indicated that most persons who returned the questionnaires have definite opinions on most of the subjects covered. The greatest uncertainty—more than one person in five undecided—centered around our support of British efforts to guarantee majority rule in Rhodesia. While I consider this an important issue, apparently it has not attracted a great deal of public attention. Those with an opinion were quite evenly divided.

THREE-FOURTHS SUPPORT

All the remaining questions received a majority of support. Three out of four respondents favored a change in the electoral college system and federally required safety features for new cars.

TWO-THIRDS SUPPORT

Among the issues that attracted at least 50 percent, but fewer than 66 percent, of support were these: 4-year terms for Congressmen; an increased minimum wage; a new Federal Department of Transportation; more Federal aid to education; a Federal highway beautification program; and Federal aid to cities for police training.

TABULATION

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following tabulation, question, by question, showing the percentage responses to my questionnaire:

[Results in percent]

1. Vietnam—Should we—

a. Withdraw our forces completely?	28
b. Maintain our present policy of limited involvement while containing to seek negotiations for peace?	42
c. Increase our military activities?	30

2. Do you favor 4-year terms for Congressmen?

Yes	62
No	31
Undecided	7

3. Do you favor raising the present $1.25 minimum wage?

Yes	50
No	41
Undecided	9

4. Do you favor a Department of Transportation that would bring under one department all Federal agencies now engaged in transportation activities?

Yes	60
No	24
Undecided	16

5. Do you favor a change in the electoral college system to divide a State's electoral votes in proportion to the popular vote instead of on a winner-take-all basis?

Yes	75
No	14
Undecided	11

6. Do you favor tax relief for persons who make small political contributions?

Yes	30
No	62
Undecided	8

7. Do you favor expanded U.S. trade in nonstrategic goods with eastern European countries?

Yes	66
No	24
Undecided	10

8. Do you favor a Federal requirement that auto manufacturers include additional safety features on new cars?

Yes	73
No	21
Undecided	6

9. Do you favor continued U.S. support of the British Government in opposition to the Smith regime in Rhodesia?

Yes	43
No	35
Undecided	22

10. Do you favor "truth in packaging" and "truth in lending" laws?

Yes	86
No	7
Undecided	7

11. Do you favor the return of a percentage of Federal funds to State and local governments?

Yes	66
No	20
Undecided	14

12. Do you favor expanded Federal aid to education?

Yes	56
No	37
Undecided	7

13. Do you favor Federal action against water and air pollution?

Yes	88
No	10
Undecided	2

14. Do you favor a Federal program to beautify our highways?

Yes	55
No	36
Undecided	9

15. Do you favor Federal assistance to cities for training and strengthening their police forces?

Yes	52
No	40
Undecided	8

Let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that I consider the results of my questionnaire to be a cross-section of community thought in Minneapolis, and nothing more. The questionnaire makes no pretense of being a scientific poll. I have tried, however, to phrase the questions as objectively as possible to avoid eliciting a particular response to any of them.

BIPARTISAN RESPONSE

Those who went to the trouble of responding were, I am happy to report, representative of the entire political spectrum of Minneapolis. Three blanks were provided: Democratic-Farmer-Labor, Republican, and independent.

Thirty-four percent of the persons who returned questionnaires identified themselves as Democratic-Farmer-Laborites, 19 percent as Republicans and 37 percent as independents. An additional 10 percent did not identify themselves by party.

MANY COMMENTS

It has been gratifying to receive a large number of personal comments in the space at the bottom of the questionnaire. And more persons than ever before sat down and wrote letters containing their thoughts on some of the issues.

Mr. Speaker, I have found during my two terms in Congress that these questionnaires are most useful tools in the give and take between me and the people of my district.

Obviously it is impossible to exchange information personally with each of the nearly 500,000 residents of Minneapolis. As a substitute for personal conversations, I have discovered that questionnaires draw out opinions from many persons who otherwise would not have the opportunity to express them.

TWO-WAY CHANNEL

A two-way communications channel is imperative if a Congressman is to keep in touch with current thinking in his district. Congressman and constituent alike are, in effect, both a transmitter and a receiver of facts and opinions.

The Congressman has the dual responsibility both of initiating and working toward passage of legilsation he believes in and of representing the aspirations and desires of the voters who elected him. It is impossible, of course, for these two elements to run parallel all the time. But they are more likely to run parallel if the Congressman receives a periodic sounding of opinion in his district.

U.S.S. "Henry L. Stimson"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of receiving recently a letter from Adm. H. G. Rickover regarding the first sea trials of the 38th Polaris nuclear submarine, the U.S.S. *Henry L. Stimson*. The letter is especially significant to me because it stands as a tribute to a wonderful and very distinguished American, Henry L. Stimson.

Anyone familiar with public affairs knows of the many high public offices held by Mr. Stimson during his career. Fewer people, however, are familiar with the achievements of Mr. Stimson in his private vocation—the practice of the law. In both public and private life Mr. Stimson had as his foremost concern the welfare of society. From the time he entered private practice as an associate of Elihu Root through his service as Secretary of War under President Truman, he gave more of himself than could be expected of any one man. He was truly a citizen of which this country can justly be proud.

Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent that Admiral Rickover's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

U.S.S. HENRY L. STIMSON (SSBN 655), CARE OF FLEET POST OFFICE,
NEW YORK, N.Y.,
At Sea, North Atlantic, July 4, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. O'NEILL: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of our thirty-eighth Polaris nuclear submarine. The USS *Henry L. Stimson* was built by the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corporation, Groton, Connecticut. We also have in operation twenty-three attack type nuclear submarines, making a total of sixty-one. This ship is named for Henry L. Stimson (1867–1950), a man of notable achievements both in his vocation, the private practice of the law, and in his avocation which was public service of the appointive kind.

Born in New York City, son of a distinguished surgeon, Stimson received his education at Andover, Yale and Harvard Law School. He was only twenty-five when Elihu Root took him into partnership. The young lawyer learned much form association with this commanding figure in the legal profession of whom it was said that he had been connected with every important case in New York since 1880. Root, who became a lifelong friend and mentor, taught him not only a highly effective trial technique emphasizing painstaking preparation, close reasoning and systematic ordering of arguments—intellectual habits that proved useful to Stimson in the varied positions he later filled with great distinction—but living and working in Root's office, as he later remarked, also made him aware of "the importance of the active performance of his public duties by a citizen of New York." Though his steadily expanding practice kept him busy, Stimson found time to participate energetically in local and state politics, his chief interest being better government.

In 1906 Theodore Roosevelt appointed him to his first public office, that of U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York. Thereafter and until he finally retired in 1945 at seventy-eight, Stimson took frequent leave of absence from his lucrative private practice to assume public duties, serving under every President except Woodrow Wilson and Warren G. Harding. He was the first to sit in the cabinet of *four* Presidents (two Republicans and two Democrats): as Secretary of War under William H. Taft, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, and as Secretary of State under Herbert Hoover. He served Calvin Coolidge as adviser on Latin American affairs, peacemaker in Nicaragua and Governor General of the Philippine Islands.

All his public offices, except one, were appointive and came to him unsought. Stimson had no flair for politics of the elective kind. He lost his bid for Governor of New York in 1909. The only election he won was for delegate at large to the New York Constitutional Convention of 1915. There he worked tirelessly for reforms that would give the State a more honest and efficient government. Although in that year's election the voters rejected the revised Constitution, by 1926 almost eighty percent of the proposed amendments had become part of New York's fundamental law and thirty other States had followed suit.

Politically, Stimson was identified with the reform or progressive element in the Republican Party. His views on government were formed early in life and changed very little. They are set forth in the autobiographical book, "On Active Service in Peace and War," written conjointly with McGeorge Bundy and published shortly before Stimson's death at eighty-three. "His basic convictions were two—first that the primary and overriding requirement of all government was that it should not infringe the essential liberties of the individual, and second, that within this limitation government could and must be made a powerful instrument of positive action." The restraint imposed by law on government in the interest of "the primary and essential liberties of the individual" was, to Stimson, "a fundamental principle of any decent society. But to construe this respect for personal freedom into an assertion that all government was evil seemed to him absurd." He felt that "in the industrial civilization of the twentieth century it was the duty of government to provide for the general welfare wherever no private agency could do the job."

Given this point of view, Stimson could serve Theodore Roosevelt loyally as U.S. Attorney and Franklin D. Roosevelt equally loyally as Secretary of War. Under the Republican Roosevelt, his task was enforcement of federal laws which had been enacted to protect our society against harmful actions of large and powerful private organizations; under the Democratic Roosevelt, his task was mobilization of the country's industrial potential in support of a war we fought against powerful nations threatening our free society. He accomplished both tasks extremely well.

Stimson's private work made him rich (he remained throughout his active life a member of the firm which originally had been headed by Root), but he derived his deepest satisfaction from the public services which supplemented and at frequent intervals replaced his private activities. He once told friends that the life of an "ordinary New York lawyer" could never wholly satisfy him since it was "primarily and essentially devoted to the making of money." Stimson shared with his father a desire to serve some larger cause than his own well-being.

The elder Stimson was a first-rate surgeon but had little interest in building the profitable private practice his talents could so easily have won him. Instead, he gave all his time to hospital work, much of it devoted to the charity cases that came to him as attending surgeon at the Chambers Street House of Relief, the emergency unit of New York Hospital. He liked to quote a famous French surgeon who said he preferred the poor for his patients since God was their paymaster.

Henry L. Stimson, the son, found that when he became U.S. Attorney, thus defender of the public interest and of the people, his work had an ethical content that enormously increased the satisfactions he derived in his professional life. Now he could do something to help redress a deplorable situation he found all too common: whenever private interests came into legal conflict with public interests, whenever great public issues put "a rich corporation on one side and only the people on the other," the side of the people usually "went by default," since so few successful lawyers were "putting their shoulders to the public wheel."

There can be little doubt that ancestry had something to do with Stimson's strong sense of civic responsibility. Nearly all his forebears were of New England stock, having arrived before 1650. After the Revolution they migrated westward and took up land in upper New York State. Hardworking, thrifty self-reliant and strongly identified with their community, they fought in every war in which the country was embroiled (even as Stimson volunteered in the Spanish-American War and World War I) and produced, as he put it, "enough clergymen and deacons to keep up fairly well the moral standards of the stock."

In a more direct sense, Stimson's devotion to public service was an outgrowth of his concept of the function of law and advocacy in a democratic society. This comes out clearly in his autobiography where he describes how he came "to learn and understand the noble history of the profession of the law," and "to realize that without a bar trained in the tradition of courage and loyalty our constitutional theories of individual liberty would cease to be a living reality." He was much impressed by the experience of countries with constitutions and bills of rights not unlike our own where liberty was lost because they had no "bar with sufficient courage and independence to establish those rights by a brave assertion of the writs of habeas corpus and certiorari," and he came to feel strongly that every "American lawyer should regard himself as a potential officer of his government and a defender of its laws and constitution," for "if the time should ever come when this tradition had faded out and the members of the bar had become merely the servants of business, the future of our liberties would be gloomy indeed."

As a lawyer, Stimson brought to public office the special qualities that characterize the "professional man"; qualities that distinguish him from the "organization man" whose metier is "pure" administration. They are qualities extraordinarily valuable in a public servant, yet increasingly difficult to find in this age of giant organizations when it is common practice to fill high government posts with men whose careers have been the management of large private organizations. There is always a danger that private organizational loyalties may consciously or unconsciously influence such men in their public work; that they may in a sense think of themselves as ambassadors from the private to the public area. Stimson, who had a law practice awaiting him after each venture into public life, was bound by no conflicting loyalties. He could and did bring total dedication to every public task he assumed.

He had the professional man's respect for technical expertise; this led him to take infinite pains collecting able men to assist him whenever he took on a new post. He did not glibly assume that all it takes to improve an organization is to put a capable administrator at its head who will then issue orders that will make it "efficient." Nor did he believe in blind obedience to commands emanating from superiors on the administrative totem pole; he had the professional man's habit of acting upon his own considered judgment and of according other professionals the same right. Of his service in World War II, Robert H. Ferrell wrote that "no few words or easy statement can indicate the labor that produced an American Army and sent it over the world. Stimson's contribution was to put brains at the center of the War Department, to create a situation in which men of intelligence and knowledge could work together without feeling that whatever they did would be cancelled by some ignoramus higher up the chain of command."

Finally, Stimson had the professional man's commitment to a personal code of ethics. Nobody believed more strongly than he in a cabinet member's loyalty to his President but he never hesitated to stand up to a presidential action he thought wrong. A notable example was his insistence in opposing Franklin D. Roosevelt's approval of the Morgenthau Plan which would have stripped Germany of her industrial plant and turned her into an agricultural country.

The services public servants in high appointive office are expected to render the nation are not unlike the services a competent and responsible professional man renders his client. Thus, it is not surprising that the qualities Stimson possessed as a professional man should have made him an outstanding public servant. He was, as his biographer Elting E. Morison wrote, "a forthright gentleman, a great trial lawyer, a courageous soldier, a dedicated public servant, a statesman who would live in grateful hearts."

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

Commencement Address by Dr. Alphus R. Christensen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1966

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, last month marked the delivery of numerous addresses by distinguished Americans at commencement exercises at this Nation's colleges and universities. These speeches are always designed to give meaning and inspiration to the educational achievements of the college graduates.

One of the outstanding speeches this year was the commencement address delivered in my district in Ohio at Rio Grande College by its president, Dr. Alphus R. Christensen.

Since the date of the commencement, June 5, 1966, marked not only the completion of 4 years of study by the graduating students but also the 4th year of Dr. Christensen's great service to Rio Grande College as its president, it was indeed most appropriate that he should be the commencement speaker.

I wish to commend this commencement address to the attention of my colleagues:

PUT A TIGER IN YOUR TANK

(Rio Grande College commencement address by Alphus R. Christensen)

Good Afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen: In 1939, 27 years ago this month, I began my work toward a master's degree at Northwestern University. I had received a fellowship from that great university. In November of the preceeding year, 1938, I had purchased my first car—a 1936 Chevrolet. It had a stick shift and it had four-on-the floor—if you counted reverse. I was proud of that car—it was my only significant material possession. Even though I was just a country boy from the plains of South Dakota, I was determined to take it with me to the big city; however, my parents had other ideas. They suggested I leave the car at home and take the train, and then I wouldn't have to worry about it. But being a man of determination, as all young men are, I insisted this was my automobile and I was taking it to Chicago with me.

The first day I reached the Twin Cities—Minneapolis and St. Paul—spent the night with friends, and the next morning I started for Chicago. Somewhere west of Chicago, late that afternoon, I began to wonder if I was ever going to get to Evanston. As it began to get dark I dropped into a service station to ask for directions. I told them I was looking for Highway #58 which would lead me into Evanston. I was assured that I was headed in the right direction and that soon I would reach the junction. Just as I pulled out of the station, I found that the stick would not stay in gear. I would put it in low and it would slip back to neutral—the same was true for all gears, so I drove the rest of the way holding the stick in high gear. I had had some experience driving with one hand, but not under such circumstances. You can imagine my predicament—visions of serious transmission trouble—my parents' suggestion. How was I going to pay for it? Shades of gloom. Once again I should have listened to my parents. Finally I nursed my pride and joy into the parking lot at Northwestern—unpacked and went to bed.

The next morning, while shaving and showering, I related my story to a couple of new acquaintenances—who, incidentally, were to become personal friends. One of these men—more sophisticated than I was—suggested I contact the Chevrolet garage and have someone come out and examine the car.

During breakfast I turned the idea over in my mind. I finally decided that I might as well get some expert advice, so I called the garage. Arrangements were made to meet at the parking lot at 3:00 o'clock that afternoon.

I stationed myself at the entrance shortly before three, and soon the tow truck drove up. The driver got out. I pointed out my car. He looked at the license and said, "Oh, you are from South Dakota." Momentarily, I didn't know whether I had to defend myself or to brag. Before I could say anything, he told me had been born and reared in Yankton. I told him I had spent quite a bit of time in Yankton because I had a friend who lived there.

He asked me if I happened to know a certain lady who had a local reputation as a poet. I told him I had been at her home several times to visit and listen to her read poetry. He smiled and said that was his aunt. We chatted for awhile about Yankton. Frankly I didn't object because I didn't think this past relationship was going to hurt my present case.

Finally, he said, "Let's pull the car down to the garage and see what the trouble is." So off we went. As we approached the garage, I noticed that next to the garage was the Emerson Radio Company factory, and Lo and Behold—there was a picket walking up and down in front of the plant. Being from a rural area, I had read about pickets; I had referred to them in speeches, exalted their virtues or denied their need in debates, but I had never seen a live picket before.

After we pulled into the garage, I left my car to examine this picket more closely. I walked up and down with that picket, back and forth in front of the Emerson Radio Co., asking what I know he considered very, very stupid questions. After about 20 minutes I knew that he was getting disgusted with me so I returned to the garage.

I found my car quite unattended. I thought to myself—Oh, my—this is going to be terrible; this is such a big job that they don't even want to start it this afternoon; they are going to wait until tomorrow morning. I sought out the only person I knew in that garage, the man who came and towed me in. I walked up to him, and I know that I didn't look very happy. I said, "I see my car is standing over there by itself. Did you find out what the trouble was?" "Oh," he said, "yes, we did. It is already repaired." I knew right then and there it couldn't cost me too much. The problem was simple—a pin had slipped out—it had been replaced and the car was ready to go. What a wonderful break for me! I asked him, "How much is the charge?" He looked at me and said, "Mister, we don't charge people from South Dakota anything."

Well, now I don't know whether his motive was altruistic, whether it was determined by a self-enlightened interest, or whether my countenance of dismal financial dismay caused him to decide not to charge me anything, but I did learn something. I realized that here was a service man who, long before the slogan-makers of Madison Avenue designed that one, "put a tiger in your tank," had put a "tiger in his tank," and I will tell you why. I spent three summers at Northwestern University, and I sang the praises of that garage to every person I met, and I also used that garage for any difficulties I had. I did account for at least 38 other individuals who made use of the service of that garage—not only did they provide good service, but quality workmanship. Now imbedded in this personal, factual illustration are four principles which should be basic to every institution of higher learning in the United States, and I hope, as President of Rio Grande College, these four principles prevail on this campus; these principles will emerge as we continue this discourse.

In March of this year I attended the annual meeting of the Association for Higher Education in Chicago. I chose on that occasion to attend a group discussion—No. 11—entitled "Employer Expections in Conflict with Institutional Expections." On the panel were two men: Dr. Roy Bryant, Professor of Higher Education and Director of Placement, University of Southern Illinois; and Mr. Roye Walters, Director of College Employment of one of the small corporations of this country, American Telephone and Telegraph—AT&T. In addition, in that audience, were two other individuals who held corresponding jobs in other small corporations, General Motors and United States Steel. Now out of the discussion that lasted two hours in the morning and three in the afternoon, three common goals were agreed upon. Dr. Bryant had conducted, among 42 of the largest school systems in the State of Illinois, an open-ended questionnaire survey in which he wanted to find out what the superintendants were looking for in teachers. Mr. Walters, who had employed many, many college graduates, had made a similar study, based upon his own experience and upon the experience of other industries in the United States and fortunately corroborated by the two gentlemen who held corresponding positions with General Motors and United States Steel. Agreement was unanimous on the following points: (1) teach the students to think, (2) teach them how to communicate, and (3) realize that inter-personal relations are important.

Now I am going to change the wording of one of these goals just a bit, because after I returned from Chicago I began to wonder about this word "think." Maybe the scientists had discovered the intricacies of the thinking process; maybe we now knew what goes on in the mind when we "think." I read several books after returning from Chicago, and I found out we still didn't know, but what these men were driving at was this: teach the students how to solve problems, make a decision on the basis of the solution of the problem, and ultimately act on that decision; that was what they meant by thinking—in other words—a felt difficulty, a problem defined, an evaluation and analysis of the problem, several possible solutions, selection of the correct solution, then action upon that solution. So, instead of saying to these young men and young women that I hope that we have taught you to think, I am going to say I hope that we have taught you the fundamental skills, which must be refined in the future—necessary to make decisions. Always making that decision with this reservation—subject to change—because, Ladies and Gentlemen, if you and I are going to wait until all the evidence is in—until we can compile and document all the evidence and data, we probably would never make a decision. Decisions must be made on selected opinions and on selected pieces of evidence which you may or may not be able to document. You will make fewer errors in the future as you refine the process.

They tell us that knowledge is power—and knowledge is power, but knowledge today is such a nebulous thing. It is so changing, particularly in our technological and scientific fields, that what you learn here today probably will change tomorrow—except in some areas—except in the areas of general education, the liberal arts, that classical portion of education. If we have given you the opportunity to learn how to, at least begin to make decisions, to decide, and then to act upon that decision, we have accomplished something.

The second significant point, and they did not put these in any rank order, these gentlemen who spoke to us that day in Chicago, was to teach you how to communicate orally and in a written manner. You may know something, but if you cannot put it on paper so that other people can understand it, or if you cannot express it orally in a manner that it can be understood by other individuals, it makes no difference what you know. I hope that we have given you an opportunity, not only in the classroom, but since we are a small college, an opportunity to communicate with your peers and to communicate with your instructors outside of the classroom. Now when you talk about communication, I'm talking about the simple, direct type of communication. And I think anyone who attempts to communicate should communicate as simply and directly as possible. There is no value in using a 25 cent word when a 10 cent word will do. Some people are inclined to be verbose, but I don't think that is honest and true communication. For example, there was a plumber who wrote to a research bureau pointing out that he had used hydrochloric acid to clean out sewer pipes and inquired whether there was any possible harm. The first written reply that came back from this research bureau was as follows: "The efficacy of hydrochloric acid is indisputable, but the corrosive residue is incompatible with metallic permanence." The plumber then thanked them for this information approving his procedure. This dismayed the research bureau so they wrote him another letter saying, "We cannot assume the responsibility for the production of toxic and noxious residue with hydrochloric acid and suggest you use an alternative procedure." Once more the plumber thanked them for their approval. Well, the research bureau didn't know what to do, so they called in a third scientist; he wrote the plumber saying, "Don't use hydrochloric acid. It eats hell out of the pipes." Now that type of communication he could understand. He knew what they meant. In becoming communicators be sure that you communicate directly, briefly, and clearly, because one of the major problems in communication whether it is oral or written is semantic; the choice of words. Choice of the right word is needed to express the idea that you have in mind. If we always choose the right word, we will be much more effective.

The third point was inter-personal relations. I have reduced that to the one word, relate. The gentleman, who represented United States Steel, in talking about college graduates who he had employed over the years reminded us that he could not recall one instance where an employee was dismissed for lack of technical knowledge. Whenever they had to dismiss an individual it was for some other reason, and more often than not it was for the reason that the person did not have the ability to get along with others. He said this was one of the most significant qualifications a person should have who is seeking employment. As I have said, I reduced that phrase to the word relate. So I want you not only to be able to communicate, to make decisions, but I want you to develop that skill of relating yourselves to other individuals. You have had golden opportunities on this campus to do that too. Again you have had that opportunity because we are small, again because we have had to rely on many of you to participate in our extra-curricular activities—to participate in those things which may happen and occur outside of the classroom. You have had to learn to get along—particularly the boys who had to live three-in-a-room this year in a two-in-a-room dormitory; I am sure there were certainly some inter-personal relations under those circumstances.

Now, in my estimation, imbedded in this third point is a fourth. It was never discussed; it never came up during that five hour period; however, I am positive it was implied—that point, to serve. Actually all you have to offer is service. If you will recall my initial illustration, factual illustration, that gentleman offered service way beyond the call of duty. Much more than was asked of him, much more than was absolutely necessary. And I know in talking to public school superintendents, not only in southeastern Ohio, but in other states of the Union, one of the major problems they have in employing teachers is finding persons who are willing to do the complete job and not expect to be remunerated in some way or other for every little task that they are asked to do. In fact, I had one superintendent tell me, and this story may be apocryphal, that he recalled an instance where a teacher trampled the children when the final bell sounded in the afternoon as she raced them out of the room. Now I don't believe that is service. I don't believe you are serving under those circumstances. Here at Rio Grande College we have given you an opportunity to serve, and I will say this, and I have much evidence of it in my office, in my files, of superintendents who have said this of Rio Grande College graduates—that these graduates are willing to go a little bit further, to give just a little more. I had a superintendent of a rather large district tell me that if he had a choice, everything else being equal, to choose between a Rio Grande College graduate for the classroom and another one from another institution he would choose the Rio Grande College graduate because of this little bit of extra something our graduates are willing to give.

So I say to you, the significant thing is to serve. Serve your employer; serve your community; serve your church; serve your fellowman and serve your Alma Mater. And your Alma Mater as of today is Rio Grande College. You have an obligation to this institution. You have an obligation that you will never be able to repay. Many of your are seated here today because, if Rio Grande College had not been located where it is, you would not have an education. Others of you are here today because you could not attend the college of your choice, but you were accepted at Rio Grande College; you have developed; you have progressed and you have reached this point today. You owe something to Rio Grande College. You have paid during the last several years $800 for tuition. It costs about $1100 in the E & G budget to support each one of you. That extra bit of money—that $300 difference—has to come from someplace. If we didn't have educationally-minded men and women serving on our Board of Trustees, as we do; if we didn't have friends of Rio Grande College who are willing to contribute financially to the welfare of this institution, it would be impossible for us to keep our fees within reason. They would be higher, much higher.

I don't think a week passes that I don't hear from some graduate or former student, either verbally or in a written manner, praising Rio Grande College. I love to hear it—it's music to my ears—it makes me proud of Rio Grande. However, talk is cheap. Praise will not pay salaries. Praise will not pay the utility bills. Praise will not erect new buildings. Praise will not maintain present structures. It takes money! I honestly believe you are obligated to contribute to the financial obligations of your Alma Mater. You must help so students who follow you have the same opportunities which you have had. I think we could cut the tuition if it were possible to balance our budget with words of praise, but we can't do it that way.

This past spring Dean Schaefer and I were negotiating with an individual, a new staff member for this campus, who at the present time is an associate professor at one of the larger universities in a western state. He comes from this area, from this region; he wanted badly to come back to this area. We couldn't meet, of course, his salary demand. When I had to write and tell him that it was impossible for us to get together, I received a very nice letter from him, a long letter. I would like to read a couple of sentences from that letter—"The school and the persons associated with the school are dear to me. If Rio Grande College had not existed, I might not have done anything in my life except dig coal or farm in Cheshire Township." Those are noble words—a beautiful tribute. It was a two page letter, so I shook the pages hoping something more substantial would fall out of it. I even held the envelope to the light to see if something was hidden within. But alas, to no avail, just words.

Each year a number of private colleges and universities cease to exist as such. No longer can they compete. The spirit is gone. The struggle is too great so they forfeit their identities, either by affiliating with some state system, some other institution, or they just wither and die, and we don't want that to happen to Rio Grande College. We want that diploma of yours to mean something, and we want it to grow in meaning. We want it to be as sound as blue chip stocks. We want it to be as good as any diploma you might earn from any institution, and the only way to we can do that is to obtain support from you and the friends of Rio Grande College.

Remember now, we have given you—basically, at least—the development of the fundamental skills to decide, to communicate, to relate, and to serve. Commencements and diplomas are nothing more than punctuation marks in the process of learning which is never completed.

Commencement Address by Dr. Ronald C. Nairn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the following excellent address which was given at the commencement exercises of the University of Arizona on June 1 by Dr. Ronald C. Nairn, president of Prescott College, Prescott, Ariz. Dr. Nairn is an outstanding authority on southeast Asia, and I believe his remarks, "The American Intellectual and Southeast Asia," will be of great interest to all my colleagues:

We, the American intellectuals, need an intellectual reformation. The great historical dramas which the intellectual world has faced especially since World War I, continuously reveal the redundancy in intellectual conceptions; the inadequacy of information, the emotion rather than the intellectuality of response, and particularly the tendency to conduct intellectual dialogue around constricting confines of relatively middle-aged ideologies. Race relations, the integrity of individual cultures, man and violence, values in a techno-economic society especially theological values, just to quote some examples, are less and less viewed as primary intellectual questions but rather as resolvable issues per medium of this or that ideological system. And yet nothing is resolved: and the intellectual becomes either mute or a cliché-touting countermarcher. There is, I repeat, a need for an intellectual reformation.

Here, tonight, is gathered the human resources of a great university, representing an important segment of American intellectual life. The concern of the American intellectual with great historical dramas should be your concern, and the response your response. Tonight instead of talking vaguely about a "challenge of the future", I would like to bring you a real challenge, one centered about my call for an intellectual reformation but using a current historical drama, Southeast Asia, as the focus. My contention is that the American intellectuals' concern with Southeast Asia reveals that we are not handling this historical drama very well.

Let me select, at random, a few examples from Southeast Asia to illustrate my general point. Basic to any intellectual exercise is the assembling of data, or shall we call it "knowledge". Society in Vietnam, as one example, is at least as complexly structured as the atom. It is strange, is it not, that people who could never be persuaded to publicly declaim upon the structure of an atom can barely wait to make the most elaborate commentary on what is wrong with the structure of society in Vietnam and indeed elsewhere in Southeast Asia. I can quote many examples. In May 1962, there was a notable first, a prelude to a veritable flood. Some of our most distinguished scholars, including a Nobel Prize winner, signed an open letter calling for the general restructuring of society in South Vietnam, including such things as the liquidation of the President, Ngo Dinh Diem. Upon what did they base this call? Did they have the same kind of knowledge about Vietnam as they would have brought to commentary on the atom or was their advocacy of this radical, and indeed brutal, action based upon something more primitive? I suspect the real knowledge of Southeast Asia held by this symbolic intellectual group was slight. For example, the much-quoted cliché that we must "win the minds of the Vietnamese peasant" arose at this time. It just so happens that the first full-length study ever written by an American on the Vietnamese peasant appeared in print only last year. What then do those who declaim this cliché mean? Where do they get their basis in reality? It occurs to me that most of us would be hard put to provide a formula for winning the minds of the people of Arizona, our own people. But, here it was; Americans must not only "win the mind of the Vietnamese peasant", but as well, restructure his society—a remarkable requirement based, I suggest, on ignorance.

I doubt if one could find today 100 Americans fluent in the written and spoken Vietnamese language. How many of you here tonight have read a comprehensive Vietnamese history—there is only one in the English language. The American people have been told that 80% of the Vietnamese are Buddhist—the reality is that nobody knows, but I would say that fewer than 30% could be classified as Buddhist; and this group is highly-fragmented geographically and as regards Buddhist belief. And, so I could go on, questioning the basic data so many intellectuals use as premises for their commentary on Southeast Asia.

I believe we have an intellectual responsibility as old as our Greek progenitors that first part of any intellectual discourse is assembling of knowledge about a subject. This is a sacred element in the search for truth. It is even more sacred when the reality of things stirs us emotionally. We face real intellectual dangers if we do not have the integrity to at least strive for the reality of things when we use our intellectual status to become public spokesmen. Confucius summed it up well; he said, "Thinking without knowledge is a dangerous pastime." The American intellectual relative to Southeast Asia is indeed indulging in a dangerous pastime and is doing little for his intellectuals' reputation.

This leads to another random factor—the "patterned" thinking that the American intellectual brings to many contemporary problems. Let me expand. We have developed an etiology—a philosophy of the causation of things—which constrains free intellectual investigation. Rousseau was one progenitor and gives one illustration of what I mean. To Rousseau man was good by nature, a considerate and kindly fellow. If he were not good, but instead violent, brutal, selfish, deceitful, and even murderous, then this was due to his environment or to the system of government. It was, therefore, not necessary to consider the reality of violence, brutality, selfishness, deceitfulness, cruelty, and killing, because, if the system were changed, then man reverted to his natural, kindly self. Let us see what this kind of patterned thinking means relative to the historical drama in Southeast Asia. The few American writers on economics and politics in Southeast Asia, basically starting after World War II, were mainly concerned with the issue of colonialism. They said that colonialism was bad and that when the inevitable nationalist revolution ensued and was inevitably successful, then the new nationalist elan would evolve into democracy and with the advent of democracy would come well-being and contentment of all people.

The thesis was, of course, nonsense; and the trouble with such "patterned" reasoning is not that we make mistakes now and again. Rather it is that, with "patterned" reasoning, we become unable to analyze new situations. As intellectuals have so often demonstrated in the past, the applications of formula to a situation is but reliance on ancient but comforting rituals and is the anti-thesis of a free, unfettered search for truth. It has become a contemporary ritual that solution to Southeast Asia's and America's problems will be easy and immediate if some great devil image like colonialism, a military dictator, or a repressive non-democratic premier, or the advancement of "free" elections occurs. Is it any wonder then, that the intellectual, who is usually appalled by the destructiveness wrought by American military might, can, by a strange about-face, condone counterdestruction of a society and justify all this by his "patterned" reasoning which allows him to readily diagnose the social and political cancer obstructing health and above all gives the same intellectual the right to recommend the most violent remedies for the promotion of instant salvation.

I could further this theme, but let me now take one *practical* example affecting United States involvement in Southeast Asia and see if I can tie together some of the syndromes I have been talking about. Let me talk about a great American concern, which will, no doubt, become even greater when the shooting stops, as it will, in Southeast Asia.

I refer to what we call "underdevelopment" and the consequent aid process. Conceptually, the idea of underdevelopment within the human family is abhorrent and offensive to the real or potential dignity of the human individual. The word "underdevelopment" raises quite profound emotions. You will recall that much of our "patterned" scholarship divides the world into an underdeveloped segment; a smaller transitional segment, that is, a move to something better; and an even smaller segment which is "developed".

Southeast Asia, of course, falls within the "underdeveloped" category. But, what is meant by the word "underdevelopment" as it applies in reality to the lives of Southeast Asian people? Would we, for example, say that the religious sense of Southeast Asia is underdeveloped? I have lived some of my life with Thai peasants. Between 80–90% of the peasant male populace in Thailand at one time or another becomes a Buddhist priest. Some pursue their studies only for the period of Lent, some for a year or so, some all their life. In a nation of some 6 million adult males, nearly ½ million, at any one time, are priests. If this is "underdevelopment," what development would you propose? And let us take a Southeastern Asian family—religion and family are, after all, fairly important ingredients in living.

Is the Vietnamese family "underdeveloped"? Some belong to a unilineal descent group which has immutable ties over time and space. Should these ties be broken? Should the family become tenuous? Is filial piety an out-of-date conception? Is family economic sharing un-Keynsian? I could go on and ask about handicraft, art, ceremony and festivals, village sociology, and the harmony of man and nature in Southeast Asia. I think what the users mean by "underdevelopment", is underdevelopment in an industrial sense and here it is clear Southeast Asia does not have the drive, the skills, the management, and above all, the resources and techniques possessed by the United States and Western Europe. Thus, here we face the first syndrome; our desire to change a reality we have not defined. We tell these people they have to change. We have now been telling the Vietnamese for five years that they must reform. Change or reform what?

Do we mean only to build factories and roads or reform something else, and if so, what? Do we really mean change of all of their society and if so, to what model? Why will a Thai peasant village use its highly-developed construction skills to build a beautiful Buddhist temple when, for their development in the mode of the West, they should build a dam to hold water or a bridge to promote commerce.

Why will the individual peasant have a picture painted on the tailboard of his cart rather than spend the money to buy some grease for its squeaky axle? The most perverse of all results coming from the present thinking which divides the world into underdeveloped is that we, of the developed world, have conceived a model into which the underdeveloped must aspire and have assumed that it is our duty to make good this transition. With this kind of "patterned" thinking, based upon a massive lack of data or knowledge, a frightening situation arises. The Nazis had their model of the Nordic superman. The Russians have theirs of the new Soviet man. Here are models to which people must be molded. Do we have a model for Southeast Asia? When you talk about transplanting the "Great Society" in Vietnam, what does this mean to a Vietnamese?

On the one side, the Communists are saying it is bad to be a South Vietnamese, that their society is not progressive, that it should be destroyed and Vietnamese must develop into the Communist model of modern man. The Communists with their patterned thinking say that this is an inevitable progression, the pattern of history. Are we not also telling the South Vietnamese that it is bad to be a Vietnamese, that they must also be made over in another image of modern man. Two peoples are now telling them it is bad to be a Vietnamese.

The tragedy of this situation is that as far as the Communists are concerned, they have no alternative. They are caught up in their own dogma, their own "patterned" thinking, but we, in the United States, should be different. We should be the very anti-thesis of the Communist obsession to recreate man in a preordained image. It is extraordinary, is it not, that some intellectuals (and here I must extend my preview well beyond the United States) who wring their hands about the physical destruction of a Southeast Asian village, would, if they got the chance, make over tomorrow a whole Southeast Asian society into what they, the intellectual, knew to be "good." Aggression can come in many forms as modern totalitarian movements have demonstrated and social, cultural, and economic aggression need not produce a lesser trauma than physical aggression. But to repeat, the tragedy is that this is a betrayal of the American ways and the fact that the leadership of such betrayal may belong to distinguished American intellectuals does not mitigate the act.

As I sense the American dream, the historic mission of this nation was respect for the integrity of every single human, and this is what we should return to in our relationships with Southeast Asia and indeed elsewhere. It would be exciting, would it not, to attempt to make the world safe for diversity, or should I say the integrity of the individual human, rather than for conformity to the mass.

Tonight I have barely touched upon some of the stereotyped thinking which is plaguing our intellectual world. The examples drawn from Southeast Asia could have been continued ad infinitum, and let me quickly present two or three more.

War is no longer being examined but reacted to, usually in a negative or an apathetic manner. Vis-a-vis the current war in Veitnam, a study of the "teach-ins" leads one to imagine that Mao Tse Tung does not exist. Yet this man has been the most prolific and original writer on war over the past 300 years and personally claims, as of now, to be an exponent of "Protracted Limited War". This might at least be intellectually acknowledge. On a more philosophic note, regarding war, we have heard of the term "unjust wars". This is alarming because I fear that these same people could easily on another occasion talk about "just wars"; and "just wars", we know, have always been the most bloody and holocaustic in history. Perhaps war is neither "just" or "unjust", but a vivid demonstration of limitations inherent in contemporary human existence. Intellectual probing of war, I suggest, is needed; and I suggest that carrying a sign bearing a vague cliché is a poor substitute for hard thinking about realities.

There are other more abstract issues about Southeast Asia almost unknown to the contemporary American intellectuals. The Buddhist process of logic and its conflict with Aristotelian logic; Freud and the Adhidhammas; peasantry as an existential expression, especially in a technological age; the nature of God or the transcendent; or if you want to be practical, cybernetics and its impact on politics and culture in Southeast Asia. The spectrum of the Asian unknown is wide.

It seems to me, therefore, that rather than seeing a great intellectual ferment stirred up by Southeast Asia, instead, we have intellectual despair and confusion. It often seems to me that the placard-carrying intellectual is indulging more in a form of psychic therapy to relieve his intellectual confusion rather than giving perceptive thought to real issues. This is why I suggest an intellectual reformation—not a revolution because revolutions have a distressing habit of consuming their own young—which, I suggest, is a debilitating intellectual process, that is if you accord the past any validity.

What then in a positive sense is meant by intellectual reformation because a great nation and a great intellectual community when it recognizes its shortcomings does not give way to sickly, despairing introspection. Rather it goes out and meets this challenge, prevails and is regenerated. The great historical dramas of our times need not frighten us even when we do not understand them. Rather as intellectuals, we should be stimulated to strike off intellectual shackles and use the occasion to get new insights. But we must reform. We must cleanse our intellectual home, free our thinking from the humbug of middle-age ideologies, and free ourselves from the vested interests of the ideological and intellectual establishments which thrive on the comforting status quo given by the soporific of "patterned" thinking. Reformation is, however, basically an individual process, as is all salvation. No one can do it but you. It is you, the individual who must resume a new humbleness before that which you do not know. It is the individual who must assume his or her own responsibility for individual action in seeking out the truth about that which he first admits is not known. Above all, it is only the individual who can bring integrity to his action and without integrity we can never know truth.

It becomes increasingly clear that the great historical drama in Southeast Asia about which I have talked of tonight and the response of the American intellectual to this drama is but a symptom of a vast intellectual disturbance the roots of which (in my opinion) go deep into the failure of 20th century liberalism to accept the reality of the world as an existential thing and especially intellectualism's allied action in endeavoring to dispense with human values and instead make politics, social action and culture conform to simple utilitarianism—but this is another topic. The drama of Southeast Asia and the American involvement is as good an excuse as any for us to pause and review our intellectual decline and see if we—you, the graduating class of '66, and we, your teachers—might not recognize our inherent intellectual greatness and act in bringing forth its realization.

Humbleness, action, integrity—is there an intellectual substitute? Our nation needs us in this role; and, the world about us, upon which we impact so mightily, needs the American intellectual in this role. Neither our nation nor the world can long suffer us if we continue to fail in our trust.

Senator Charles E. Daniel Looked Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, many solutions have been offered to the civil rights problems confronting our beloved Southland and the Nation in recent years. Some have stood in the schoolhouse door. Others have suggested nullification, interposition and massive resistance. Still others have sought a solution to this problem through street demonstrations and disrespect for law and order.

The late U.S. Senator, Charles E. Daniel, of South Carolina, offered a positive solution to the people of South Carolina and to the people of the South. South Carolina's industrialists, educators and men of good will at the local level largely followed Senator Daniel's advice, creating job opportunity and educational opportunity for all of our people.

Mr. Speaker, the late Charles E. Daniel was one of the greatest industrialists of our time and one of the world's largest industrial contractors. He was named "Industrialist of the Year" and was presented the coveted award at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City in 1963 by former Vice President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, on behalf of the National Association of Industrial Realtors.

Mr. Speaker, July 1 was the anniversary of that great speech delivered by the late Senator Charles E. Daniel, president of Daniel Construction Co., at the annual Watermelon Festival at Hampton, S.C., in 1961.

Mr. Speaker, the Greenville News is a progressive, dynamic newspaper published in Greenville, S.C., the hometown of the late Senator Daniel. The following are excerpts of that courageous address delivered by Senator Daniel as printed this year in the Greenville News:

DANIEL LOOKED AHEAD, GAVE VIEW

In a speech at Hampton on July 1, 1961, Charles E. Daniel gave his views on what South Carolina should do to meet the economic challenge of the present and the future.

"I emphasize that we cannot manage our affairs under the same pattern of inaction we have followed in the past," he said.

The following are excerpts from his address:

"We are proud of our state and its fine people. We are proud of the progress which has been made; but most of all, we should be concerned with current problems and the implications of the future.

AT CROSSROADS

"We have arrived at a crossroads in South Carolina, economically and educationally. Though our progress has been encouraging, we must determine now to move faster from more elevated levels.

"We rank at, or near the bottom in per capita income; in standards of education; indeed, in too many areas of progressive life . . .

"We cannot catch up by maintaining the same pace nor by postponing the inevitable when others already are dealing our hands for us . . .

"We need to maneuver into positions where we can seize the offensive by fair and honest management of South Carolina's own affairs . . .

"If we are to lift South Carolina from near the bottom in so many areas of economics and public education to a position near the top, we will have to meet our industrial and agricultural challenges with all our resources and the complete and enlightened cooperation of all our people . . .

"More than ever today, management insists that plant locations be near cultural and recreational facilities; good schools, including industrial training; excellent shopping facilities; adequate air service; good living conditions in general.

"Progressive areas with these modern facilities have a decided advantage in attracting industry.

"South Carolina cannot get on an economic footing with the rest of America by being content to get only our percentage share of new development. To catch up, our state must forsake some of our old ways and aggressively outdo other states in selling South Carolina to the nation . . .

"There are two vital elements which must move together if we are to succeed: (1) A rapid elevation of the economic status of all our people; (2) A crash program of quality education.

JOBS FOR NEGROES

"The desegregation issue cannot continue to be hidden behind the door. The situation cannot satisfactorily be settled at the lunch counter and bus station levels. We must handle this ourselves, more realistically than heretofore, or it will be forced upon us in the harshest way. Either we act on our terms, or we forfeit the right to act.

"The Negro population represents a large working force in South Carolina relatively untrained. It is an important potential to industry.

"We have a definite obligation to increase the productivity of our Negro citizens; to provide them with good jobs at good wages; and to continue to assure them of fair treatment. By raising their education and economic status, we would raise the whole economy of the state."

Propaganda and Toxic War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in the May-June 1966 issue of the magazine, Ordnance, there appears an article by Brig. Gen. J. H. Rothschild. It is entitled "Propaganda and Toxic War." General Rothschild, now retired, was Chief of Research and Development for the U.S. Army Chemical Corps and is one of the Nation's better informed people on this important subject. His article is such a rational one that I feel it should be reprinted in the Congressional Record.

The article is as follows:

Propaganda and Toxic War—Despite Statistics to the Contrary, a Feeling Has Been Engendered in the Public That Chemical and Biological Weapons Are Inhumane, and Only a Free Discussion of the Subject Will Disclose the Facts

(By Brig. Gen. J. H. Rothschild)

(*Before his retirement, General Rothschild was Chief of Research and Development for the U.S. Army Chemical Corps. He now resides in Phoenix, Ariz.*)

Toxic warfare, encompassing the use of chemical and biological agents, has been in a peculiar position since World War I. It is too dangerous to ignore, but still it has not been accepted.

Why such an important means of warfare should be in this anomalous status, and what the factors are which affect decisions as to its possible use, warrant examination.

The decision as to whether the U.S. should employ toxic warfare in any form should depend only on whether or not such use enhances the over-all position of the country. This deliberation must necessarily include all aspects—basically, the political and military considerations.

Political considerations, as always, are very complex. They include the humanitarian, moral, and psychological viewpoints and the legal position. We must weigh the effects of our contemplated actions on our own people and on the peoples and other nations of the world.

The military value of toxics should be dedetermined solely on their ability to accomplish the mission as compared with other available military systems.

The purely emotional approach, unfortunately so common, does not contribute to the solution of these problems.

Chemical warfare proved itself very effective in World War I, but still it and toxic warfare as a whole are not in general use. Why not?

In the first place, it takes a long time for a weapon to be accepted. The initial reaction of the military users, a proverbially conservative group, to something new and, therefore, unfamiliar and requiring new tactics, is one of rejection. This has been true of the longbow, gunpowder, and motor vehicles of all kinds, as well as of chemical warfare.

The fifty years since the introduction of gas as a major weapon of war normally would have been expected to be time enough for its acceptance in this modern era, except for a complicating factor.

When the Germans launched the first large-scale gas attack in World War I at Ypres, Belgium, during April 1915, the Allies had nothing with which to combat this new weapon. They had been warned of the impending attack by intelligence but refused to accept the possibility of a new weapon being used. After the success of the attack, they then resorted to the historic method used against innovations in war—they declared the weapon inhumane and barbarous. However, at this time in history, the means of discussing propaganda were much more efficient than in the past, and the propaganda campaign was successful.

In fact, it was so successful in whipping up a war spirit against the "inhumane, gas-using Hun" that it was continued even after the Allies themselves were using gas very extensively and effectively.

The statistics on casualties during World War I do not support the description of "inhumane" as applied to gas when compared with other weapons of war. The ratio of deaths among gas casualties verus those among casualties from other weapons was less than a tenth. The percentage of gas casualties discharged for permanent disability was about a sixth of those wounded by other means. In addition, the suffering on the battlefields and during convalescence was less.

Biological agents were not used to any extent in World War I, but here again it is difficult to adjudge disease as inhumane compared with the weapons of war which cause trauma from explosive, fire, and radiation. Certainly none of us likes disease, but we are exposed to it constantly and use methods to try to avoid it.

When we contract a disease, medical attention can alleviate the suffering and reduce the death toll. Those who would recover from most of the diseases which probably would be selected for biological warfare would be whole human beings. This cannot always be said of those who survive after being wounded by other weapons.

The result of the propaganda campaign against gas was to inculcate a generation with the feeling that chemical warfare weapons were inhumane. This led to a period of effort to outlaw the use of gas, occasioned—as expressed by J. M. Read in his book, "Atrocity Propaganda 1914–1919"—"largely because the delegates [of the Allied Power in 1921] were still under the impression left by the first gas attacks of the war, whose cruelties were writ large for political purposes."

In this country, this culminated in President Roosevelt's statement in 1943 that the U.S. would not resort to the use of toxic-gas weapons unless they were first used by its enemies. This is the last statement of policy on the subject by the United States.

Incidentally, this policy cost many thousands of American casualties in the Pacific in World War II, and probably cost many Japanese lives as well.

The impression one gets from the actions of the U.S. Government since then is that of a fear of touching the entire subject publicly. It seems to be an ironic case of the leaders of the country selling an idea—a false one—so thoroughly to the people that now, instead of the Government exercising leadership, it is managed by the result of its action.

The limited surveys conducted show a very general public ignorance on the subject of toxic warfare, and this ignorance is fostered by the policy of the Government. Public discussion has been discouraged for many years by the restrictions in releasing information which have been placed on civilian and military officials.

The absurd result of this approach was demonstrated following the use of nonlethal riot gases in South Vietnam early last year. Instead of voluntarily releasing the information that the South Vietnamese (later, the U.S. forces) had employed tear and nauseating gases in order to save the lives of women and children being used as shields by the Viet Cong, the information was allowed to leak out through reporters.

The public outcry in this country and abroad was damaging. Our Government obviously had no prepared position, but made an apologetic, very weak defense through our highest officials. *Then*, the humanitarian aspects were brought out, and the use of riot agents became widely accepted.

With this atmosphere in our Government, logical factual considerations involving toxics are impossible. Decisions as to possible use are taken with a strong input of emotion and ignorance.

Until the Government is willing to nurture free discussion of toxic weapons, education of the public in the subject is impossible and, therefore, a meaningful determination of the American citizen's views on the employment of toxic weapons cannot be made.

What specific action is recommended? The Government should promulgate a continuing policy of free release of information on toxic weapons and the defense against them and permit officers of all military services to engage in public presentations and discussions, with the only restraint being the requirements of national security.

In other words, the present restrictions which have been imposed in the name of national policy should be removed, to permit the same type of discussion pro and con as is permitted regarding other weapons.

The moral considerations are partially based in the humanitarian aspects but go further. The fundamental morality enters when a country decides to go to war. An ethical country will not go to war unless it feels that its national existence, in an acceptable form, is seriously threatened by aggression and that there is no other resort.

Once this decision has been taken, it is difficult to understand why, within limits, any weapon of war which would give a major advantage should be eschewed. It may be within the province of an individual to say that he would rather die than do such and such, but leaders do not have the right to jeopardize their nation with this philosophy.

The limits to war which have been agreed upon in the past restrict the use of weapons or materials which are calculated to cause unnecessary suffering, to combatants or noncombatants.

In practice, according to the field manual, "The Law of Land Warfare," this comes down to "the illegality of the use of lances with barbed heads, irregular-shaped bullets, and projectiles filled with glass, the use of any substance on bullets that would tend unnecessarily to inflame a wound inflicted by them, and the scoring of the surface or the filing off of the ends of the hard cases of bullets."

Since general war has become total, the protection formerly granted to noncombatants has become less meaningful. Certainly every effort should be made to avoid the infliction of unnecessary suffering. Aside from these restrictions, however, every weapon *required* to end the war on acceptable terms and with the least loss of life to our people should be employed wherever necessary.

Most of the public objections to the use of toxics have been expressed by those who are strongly opposed to war itself. In a parallel effort to this opposition to war, the same people have opposed, through the centuries, the use of any new methods of war.

However, these two courses are entirely apart. Trying to find a reasonably safe, en-forceable way to ensure that war cannot occur is a logical action. On the other hand, trying to ban any specific weapon of war from being used after the war has started is illogical in the extreme.

Any weapon system that is being banned at a given moment always will be to the advantage of one side or the other. If that weapon system has a major impact, when the chips are down it will almost certainly be used. If it is to the enemy's advantage, we have to be prepared in any case but will be at a grave disadvantage in training and planing if we have declared that such a weapon system should not be used.

If it is to our benefit and we do not use it, we are foregoing an advantage that we can probably ill afford to give up in a life-or-death struggle.

On the psychological side, one of the arguments frequently advanced against the use of toxics is that it will give the enemy a propaganda advantage. This argument is weak, as the Communists have demonstrated that they do not need a factual basis for a propaganda campaign.

In the Korean action, for example, the Chinese launched a major propaganda campaign accusing the U.S. of using biological warfare. I was Chemical Officer of the Far East Command and the United Nations Forces during that time and can state unequivocally that there was no basis whatever for the accusation.

With regard to the legal question, the United States is not a signatory to any treaty prohibiting the employment of toxic weapons.

From the military side, the U.S. has not conducted large-scale troop tests with toxics to determine their value relative to other systems. The basic difficulty rests in the statement of policy issued by President Roosevelt in 1943, which is still in effect.

War is a complicated business. It is sufficiently difficult to train our forces in the methods we know they will use.

It is illogical to try to obtain a reasonable standard of training and planning with toxics when our country says it will not use them unless they first are used against us—implying that such use is morally reprehensible and therefore should not be employed by an enemy either.

Furthermore, the introduction of this feeling of repugnance has been a large factor in the lack of any large-scale troop tests to obtain sound data upon which to determine the comparative value of the system. In fact, there has not even been a demand for a good chemical munition for use in realistic troop tests to determine the efficacy of chemical weapons.

Until these large-scale tests are conducted and commanders actually observe the effects on their troops, no evaluation of the worth of toxics will be accepted generally by military leaders. Technical data and small-scale tests upon which to make a determination are available, but the final conclusion is open to the argument that the worth of toxics has not been demonstrated.

Is toxic warfare acceptable as a means of modern combat? Toxics proved their military value in World War I. To decide the question as to whether their use is desirable politically, we must have much more public education and discussion.

Until Government policy is changed so as to encourage such discussion, the determination of the place of toxics in the enhancement of the over-all position of the United States will remain nearly impossible.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*	
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Robert G. Dunphy.
Chief Clerk—Darrell St. Claire.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Long of Louisiana, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, McGee, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, Fannin, and Griffin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Randolph (chairman), Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Tydings, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, Murphy, and Griffin.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Michael Rodak, 6311 Joslyn Pl., Cheverly, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—H. C. Hallam, Jr., 113 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Senator Robert C. Byrd Writes in National Magazine of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area—A New West Virginia Vacation Center in the Midst of Beautiful West Virginia Scenery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, under the caption, "West Virginia's Do-It-Yourself Forest," our colleague from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], authored an interesting, inviting, and informative article for the July 1966 issue of the American Automobile Association's widely circulated magazine, American Motorist.

It was my privilege to have cosponsored my colleague's legislation under which was authorized the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area of West Virginia, and I share in his recommendation of that facility only 2 to 3 hours away from Washington, D.C., and within 350 miles for some 65 million people—more than one-third of the Nation's total population.

Senator Robert C. Byrd has demonstrated commendable leadership and concern in making our scenic State—the Mountain State—attractive and available to our citizens and tourists. I am privileged to cosponsor his legislative proposal for an Allegheny Parkway which would facilitate access to the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks Recreation Area and other unique and historical locales which he describes briefly in his timely article.

And it is appropriate to note that my West Virginia colleague cosponsored the Appalachian Regional Development Act which I introduced and managed, and which will afford improved developmental roads through scenic West Virginia and especially one in proximity to the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the article by Senator Bybd, of West Virginia, from the July 1966 issue of American Motorist.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

West Virginia's Do-It-Yourself Forest

(By U.S. Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia)

You will enjoy this pastoral paradise—an island of serenity surrounded by the population explosion—for many reasons. There are the rolling green hillsides, the abundance of colorful wildflowers, a great variety of trees and other foliage, endless rivers to fish, swim, or canoe in, and a panorama of geological and historical wonders.

It is one of the country's newest year-round vacation centers. At a safe freeway-driving speed, it is only two or three hours away from Washington, D.C., and it has been estimated that it is within 350 miles for some 65 million people—more than one-third of the Nation's total population.

I recommend the new Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area of West Virginia.

Not only will you find your days filled with pleasurable activities, but you may enjoy the feeling that here is a real modern-day do-it-yourself forest all around you. In this day of population density and disappearing natural hillsides, Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks stands, for me, as an outstanding monument to man's ability to rehabilitate nature in its finest form.

There was a time—not too long ago—when these shaded hills were scarred and blackened. The trees that stood there for a thousand years or more fell before the woodman's ax and were carted away by railroads which crisscrossed the hills. The tree bark that was left behind quickly caught fire and the flames far outreached the primitive firefighting equipment which was used to hold it at bay.

The Monongahela Forest as we know it today, was then called the "Monongahela Burn."

And burn it did, many times, until the U.S. Forest Service stepped in to acquire the land, to plant new trees and to salvage the historical monuments.

I was happy to sponsor the legislation which created the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area and I was indeed pleased to have the full support and endorsement of American Automobile Association and its members for the project. It was approved by Congress and signed into law by President Johnson in September, 1965.

All of the natural attractions are there for visitors to see. However, the legislation will permit the expenditure of Federal funds to conserve the natural resources and to develop them wisely for greater public use. We will go to work on this program immediately.

But today, visitors can enjoy the same fishing streams that the Seneca and Shawnee Indians used for the family food baskets. There is also Spruce Knob, the highest point in the State, having an elevation of 4,860 feet. Soon to go up near that peak will be an observatory tower, standing about 25 feet tall, all of native stone, and affording visitors an unobstructed view of five surrounding peaks.

Some of the many attractions to see include:

Seneca Rocks: Rising almost 1,000 feet, above a branch of the Potomac River, they are considered one of the most spectacular and interesting natural wonders east of the Mississippi. They are sometimes compared in appearance to a ruined ancient castle, but they record the geological history of the country.

Smoke Hole Cave: A former Indian home, it is located on a mountaintop and is outstanding for its maze of corridors and side rooms, representing Indian efforts for multiroom dwellings.

Smoke Hole Country: A writer in the area recently described the valley this way: "The Smoke Hole country lies in almost untouched beauty, a haven of escape, a Shrangri-La of all things—trees, flowers, animal life, scenic vistas, and climate. It provides a retreat from the disturbing noises of expanding American industrialism."

Big Cave: Formed in solid rock at an altitude of 2,200 feet in Cave Mountain, it is the best known of the many caves in the Smoke Hole Country. In it, early settlers and Confederate soldiers dug nitre which they boiled in iron kettles and used in manufacturing gunpowder.

Big Spring: Situated at the base of Cave Mountain, it is a famous fishing ground, as trout gather there where the water is always cool. The Shawnee Indians first used the area, but were driven out by the Seneca, who eventually ruled all of the region now contained in Pendleton County.

Seneca Caverns: A series of subterranean rooms, located only a few miles from the highest peak in the State, they are decorated with stalactites and stalagmites which have been fashioned by drops of water trickling through the roof of the caverns for thousands of years. The deepest room is 165 feet below the earth. Well-lighted for tourists, they contain Statue of Liberty, Niagara Falls, and Metropolitan Opera to name just a few of the interesting formations.

Hermit Island: An area of about 4.5 acres where one botanist in 1933 found 283 species of flora, indicating the abundance and variety of plants at Spruce Knob. Many nature-study groups made treks into the valley to collect rare plants. Game and fish are numerous and varied, but, strangely enough, there are a few insects.

Rivers: Two major tributaries of the Potomac River—the South Branch and the North Fork of the South Branch give life to the valley. Feeding into these are dozens of clear, cold, spring-fed streams flowing from forested watersheds, creating scenic attraction as they cascade out of the high mountains into the valley below. As it wends its way down between the rocky cliffs of the gorge, the South Fork creates some of the most spectacular fishing water and scenic beauty to be found in the eastern United States. The South Branch is noted for fishing and white water canoeing.

Timber: The high country around Spruce Knob is a bit of Canada transplanted into the West Virginia countryside, with native red spruce and other forest tree species being unique in the typically Appalachian hardwood area.

Cranberry Glades: Just outside the recreation area, the glades are a mass of color produced by the ground cover which abounds in the area. It is the site of a Visitor Information Center.

There is the story of a man who traveled through this area many years ago. He left behind his impression in a simple one-line statement: "Paradise Discovered, October 23, 1725."

Perhaps you can send a postcard from the same area reading, "Paradise Rediscovered, 1966." I hope you will come early and stay for a long time—the experience will be just what the doctor ordered.

Biographies of Political Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this week the American Library Association is holding its annual convention in New York City. I think it appropriate, therefore, to call the attention of Members to the following article which appeared in the June 1966 issue of the American Library Association Bulletin, about biographies of political figures. This article is written by Oscar Collier, president of Fleet Publishing Corp. of New York, a hard-cover book publishing company which has published in recent years such books as "Barry Goldwater, Freedom Is His Flight Plan," by Stephen Shadegg; "Lyndon B. Johnson, a Biography," by Harry Provence; "Adam Clayton Powell and the Politics of Race," by Neil Hickey and Ed Edwin; and most recently "John V. Lindsay and the Silk Stocking Story," by Caspar Citron.

Mr. Collier, a New Yorker, who was introduced to politics during his youth in Texas, offers in this article the worthy thesis that books about political figures serve a useful public function of spreading information and stimulating interest in the actions of government, but that reviews of such books often strongly criticize them for reasons that have little to do with their true value. Mr. Collier also admits that as a publisher and editor, he has enjoyed the opportunity given to him by the ALA Bulletin to reply to, and criticize, the critics—a role seldom afforded a book publisher, and all too little to those whose work in life is encouraging, assisting, and promoting others. While I do not necessarily agree with Mr. Collier's judgments, I believe his broad experience with biographies of political leaders make his views worthy of consideration.

The article follows:

Useful but Much Maligned Books

(By Oscar Collier)

The dust from the election of the mayor of New York and other 1965 political contests has settled, and, as the opening guns of new elections are being fired, perhaps it is a good time to comment on certain useful, but much maligned, books: timely books on candidates running for office or, as such books are often called, "campaign biographies."

It is tiresome to a person as interested in politics as I am to read review after review with such a typical opening statement as, "While retrospective accounts of current American politics have improved greatly in recent years, the campaign biography has remained stubbornly lodged in a literary substratum. In the best of hands, it is likely to be hastily conceived, prematurely produced, inaccurate, and—by accident or intention—obsequious." This comment is in Warren Weaver's review of *Lindsay, a Man for Tomorrow*, by Daniel Button (Random House), and *John V. Lindsay and the Silk Stocking Story*, by Casper Citron (Fleet), in *The New York Times Book Review*, October 24, 1965.

This comment is a typical cliché used by reviewers of the timely political biography. Such remarks strike me as irrelevant, because I have found that reading campaign biographies is the best way to learn a great deal quickly about candidates and public men. Bear in mind that these two books are the only ones available on John V. Lindsay and his background and that the review was published near the end of Lindsay's long, massively publicized, successful campaign for mayor of New York—a campaign which had created considerable national interest. Both Mr. Button and Mr. Citron had contracted to write their books long before Lindsay announced for mayor or, apparently, even intended to do so. Button's book is a biography, focussing on Lindsay's political career; Citron's book is a history of Lindsay's congressional district, with heavy emphasis on Lindsay's races and political methods in recent years.

The reviewer of the timely political book often comments extensively, and apparently from his own knowledge, about the political figure who is the subject of the book. In most cases, the reviewer draws heavily from the information in the book, often shortly after claiming that the book has incomplete information. Michael Harrington reviewed the Button and Citron books in the October 13 *Book Week*. After commenting that the books contained "parts" of Lindsay's record, he continued, apparently from his own knowledge, "In the 1964 congressional race, his opponent, Eleanor Clark French, documented his conservative positions against Area Redevelopment. . . ." Mr. Citron writes, quoting his interview with Mrs. French, "You've got to have government help to start a project like Area Redevelopment . . . that Lindsay voted against," and so on to considerable detail.

In some of the reviews of this kind of book, the candidate (or potential candidate) only is reviewed, and the book, except for its title, is completely ignored. In a slight variation of this approach, the review consists entirely of interesting information cribbed from the book, usually following a short attack on the book as "admiring," "hero-worshipping," or "uncritical." And often, when two or more of these books are reviewed together, there is no discussion at all of each individual book, and all are damned together for their collective defects. In another variation, one book is typically called better than the other, with faint, condescending praise for the one and outright condemnation for the other.

The political positions of some reviewers seem to make objective descriptive appraisal difficult. I recall that William Hogan in the *San Francisco Chronicle* called *Barry Goldwater: Freedom Is His Flight Plan*, by Stephen Shadegg, "press-agentry with a tom-tom beat," and Jules Feiffer in *Life* called five Lyndon B. Johnson biographies at once "mythology."

THE RISK INVOLVED

Since timely political books, including candidates' biographies, continue to appear during each preelection season and readers and librarians continue to buy them in fair numbers, this sort of book must be useful and fill a need. When you consider that the average hardcover book takes from three to six months to manufacture and that the need for information is not definitely established until about six months to a year beforehand, it becomes obvious that both publishers and authors take a considerable risk in such ventures. If the public-figure subject fails to gain a nomination or loses the election, the book is practically dead commercially. An outstanding exception, of course, was Booth Mooney's *The Lyndon Johnson Story*, republished in 1964 by Farrar, Strauss.

But the more usual fate of the book is the remainder counter. In offering a very low price for copies of a Barry Goldwater biography returned from bookstores, a remainder dealer justified himself by saying, "It's more than I paid for Nixon's." I was pleased at the bargain when I bought a well written and informative biography of Nelson Rockefeller from a remainder counter several years ago. I recall reflecting at the time that the publisher had remaindered his book too soon; it was 1962. But later events proved the publisher right. Information about some candidates just doesn't seem to sell, an additional hazard to publisher and author.

So we see that the earliest possible publication is essential to the success of these books, hence they must often be written quickly and certainly with a deadline. But even when the writer has a greater than usual head start, the inevitable comment of the reviewer is "hasty" (*Library Journal*, September 1965); and even if the candidate has repeatedly received national exposure through magazines and television, library-oriented reviewers are likely to say "of local interest only" (Virginia Kirkus, August 1965). The only way that I can imagine to explain this comment is to picture a reviewer, so wrapped up in reading and reviewing books, as to have little time for newspapers, magazines, or television.

Isn't haste in writing and publishing a virtue in books on candidates? It would be good to see a comment such as "a timely book, published with commendable speed." For there is no substitute for information in book form. No matter how complete and informative magazine articles are, they are difficult to keep at hand for explicit reference, and radio and television material usually lives on only in the mind of the listener and viewer.

Biographies of living political figures fall into two groups: the "authorized" ones, in which the subject has cooperated by providing information, often exclusively, to the author who is very sympathetic to him; and the "unauthorized" or independent books, conceived by their authors or publishers as potential good sellers or vehicles of self-expression. Of the unauthorized ones, some are favorable to the candidate-subject, even if he doesn't cooperate at all out of respect to his other chosen biographer, and others are critical and opposed to the man being written about. The authorized books are damned by many critics as "by a close friend and admirer," and the unauthorized ones are damned because of "obvious mistakes" or they are called "impersonal."

In the case of John F. Kennedy's race for the Democratic nomination for the presidency and later race for the office itself, we had two excellent books published before his race: *John Kennedy: A Political Profile*, by James M. Burns, and an "unauthorized" book, by Ed Plaut and Ralph G. Martin, *Front Runner, Dark Horse*. It seems to me that both kinds of books are very welcome. *Front Runner* has since been extensively quoted on Kennedy. Anyone who reads both books understands Kennedy's political development and the foundation of his style much better than is possible by just reading the Burns book.

THE READERS

Before proposing a new and different kind of review treatment such books might well begin to receive, I will set forth the kind of readers who read and enjoy these biographies. I myself am a good example of one class of readers—political buffs. Such readers buy or borrow and read everything that comes out about prominent candidates and men who are likely to become candidates in the future. They will read several books about a single person, if publishers and authors make them available. They want to know everything possible about the subject—including whatever biases he and his friends and supporters want to present in "authorized" books. They like to compare the various versions and note what was included and also what was left out. The book reviewer is the last person whom the author and publisher have in mind while the book is being planned and written. It is the ordinary, occasional reader—the literate voter, really—and the news-breaking, image-transmitting political columnist to whom the "campaign biography" is addressed. The authorized biographer likes to have some "news" of his subject, if possible—particularly human interest items and a chronicle of accomplishments—but he is most interested in giving the effect of complete coverage, even though there is much that he knows, and will reveal in conversation, which he leaves out of his book.

The unauthorized biographer usually assumes that the reader has a great deal of information already—but the wrong kind: fragments from magazine articles, radio and television interviews, newspaper pieces, and, possibly, a surfeit of detail from the authorized biographer. Whether he admires his subject, as is the case with Plaut's and Martin's *Front Runner* on John F. Kennedy or Harry Provence's *Lyndon B. Johnson, A Biography,* or aims to tear his subject down, as in Fred Cook's *Barry Goldwater, Extremist of the Right* or Fred Haley's *A Texan Looks at Lyndon,* the unauthorized biographer believes he possesses vital information and understanding of his subject and tries to impart what he knows to convince his readers of the correctness of his viewpoint and the superiority of his information. Often, he fails to offer the whole story, but the part he does tell is unavailable elsewhere and often expresses an important point of view toward the subject.

The authorized political biography probably descends in style and intention from accounts of the lives of the saints. It is within the older context of exemplary "lives" that it can be properly judged. The unauthorized biographer is usually a political activist and writes as a modern, personal reporter, including his own experience and knowledge. Both kinds of biographers have an intimate understanding of material which originates from their subject's public relations staff—and so do most of their regular political-buff readers. The attempts of candidates for office to shape an image do not disturb those biographers. They correctly see that this image controls the man as often as the man the image and, therefore, accept image-shaping press releases and position papers as being highly relevant to the man, his supporters, and his intentions. They also see the subject of their biographies, not as just a person, but as the leader and spokesman for a team and, often, for a substantial part of the electorate.

So I think it is fair to say that the earliest biographers of political figures are usually persons with considerable political experience and a general understanding of the politics, the issues, and the relevant history which have produced the public figure, as opposed to the private man, about whom they are writing. Probably much of the irritation of book reviewers comes from the fact that they (as sophisticated persons) know that the public man set forth in the book is not the same as the private man they have heard of, and the reviewer resents the fact that the authors are writing about and accepting seriously the public figure, images and all, and focusing on his public actions and postures instead of on his inner personality.

SOME RULES FOR REVIEW

With all the considerations pointed out above in mind—that timely biographies of political figures, which accent their images or postures, will continue to be published, bought, and read; that their authors are addressing a definite audience, not including the literary book reviewer or critic; that the authors are usually knowledgeable and seriously concerned with politics, politicians, and contemporary history, rather than with character studies; and that a book on their subject produced quickly is useful and desirable—I would like to suggest some new ground rules for critical consideration and review of biographies on public figures.

1. The reviewer should avoid the cliché preamble about how awful campaign biographies are and, rather, address himself to those interested in this kind of book. The term "campaign biography" itself should be little used or not used at all, as it carries a critical, derogatory message.

2. The reviewer should be a person known to have an interest in timely political books of all kinds and in public offices and should not be just a well-known book critic or reviewer, nor simply an experienced political reporter who is likely to believe or assert that he has better dope on the subject.

3. The fact that the book was probably written quickly and finished considerably before being published should be accepted as inevitable and the book should be welcomed rather than deplored.

4. Crusading "social critics" and sociologists should not be considered qualified reviewers, as they almost always have an axe to grind of their own and usually cannot resist the opportunity for self-expression which a political book offers to its reviewers.

5. Newspaper editorial writers and publishers are unqualified because of their habit of taking violent partisan positions. Let them roar against the book from the editorial page, not in the book reviewer's space.

6. Possibly political scientists, who both teach and have some practical political experience, are the most reliable group to choose from. Next would come persons who are known political figures themselves, particularly if they are not currently running for office.

7. Magazine editors and book editors concerned with politics or communications are qualified, as they are often knowledgeable, interested in the subject, and pleased at the opportunity to gain new information.

In sum, experienced writers, who are not bored by politics or public posturings, have much to commend them as appraisers and reviewers of books on politicians and public figures. It seems fair to ask that the reviewer will like the kind of book he is reviewing.

What should the review itself be like? First of all, it should describe the book, its coverage, its limitations. Then it should identify and place the author and assess his relationship to the candidate. In the interest of urging the voter to inform himself, the merits of the book should be set forth. If the book makes a contribution to public knowledge but is not sufficient by itself, a recommendation of other additional reading is welcome. For example, both of the Lindsay books referred to above, which are largely sympathetic to him, were reviewed by Murray Kempton in the *New York Review of Books,* together with comments on an attack on Lindsay by Noel Parmetel in *Esquire* magazine.

I believe reviewers and publications that disparage timely books on political figures do the public a disservice by sneering at political activists and discouraging the natural interest of the public in learning more about public men. There surely must be something wrong with reviews of these books when one book can be called both "the best book of its kind on U.S. politics" and "the crassest attempt to capitalize on the emergence of."

Address by Vice President Humphrey Before the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a highly significant address was delivered last week by Vice President Humphrey at the national convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, held in Los Angeles.

Vice President Humphrey reviewed the long struggle for civil rights and the advances that have been achieved, and he also outlined problems which continue to confront the movement and the philosophy that can guide us in seeking to meet these problems.

In reading over this speech—and I have done so several times—several points that the Vice President made appealed to me as particularly impressive. These included:

We have the moral obligation to match our promises with performance and to reward faith with fulfillment.

We must understand that now the question is not whether all men shall have a full measure of freedom and justice but how it shall be provided.

There is no room in America for racism of any color. We must reject calls for racism, whether they come from a throat that is white or one that is black.

Programs financed by all of the people—black and white—shall not be operated to benefit only part of the people.

There is an urgent need for new initiatives and responsibility in civil rights matters by our States and local governments.

As may be noted from the few observations cited above, the Vice President, in his address before the NAACP, not only was offering wise counsels to the delegates assembled at this important convention, but was expressing principles of morality and justice which are equally applicable to all of us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, as delivered at the National Convention of the NAACP in Los Angeles, Calif., on July 7, be printed in the appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

America is marching on the road to freedom.

I am proud to be back among my friends of the NAACP who have led this march for 57 years.

From the shadows of a dark past toward the shining hope of a brighter tomorrow, this march has been difficult, uncertain, and often dangerous. But history shall surely record its glory.

For we marched . . . even when our band was small and our ranks thin and ragged . . .

even when victory seemed a distant and unattainable goal.

There have been young marchers and old . . . Negro and white . . . rich and poor . . . but always marching with a common spirit—moved by a common hope—and striving for a common objective.

We marched and fought against separate and unequal education, and segregated lunch counters, and a seat in the back of the bus.

There have been defeats, but many more victories.

There have been many heroes, and some martyrs.

Yes, the road to freedom is tained with tears and the blood of many Americans—including men such as Medgar Evers—men already counted among authentic American heroes.

We have learned there is no single road to follow. . . no one program . . . no one slogan that will bring us to the end of our march.

There have been many things to do, and many roles to play. And through the years the NAACP has played a role second to none in terms of dedication and determination of sacrifice and courage.

We are here today because of millions of hours spent in the courthouse and on the courthouse steps—sitting down and standing up—in voter registration drives and in the halls of Congress.

Our triumphs have been impressive and numerous. Our progress has been unmistakable. Yet these triumphs and this progress must be judged from the perspective of the man who has borne the burden of oppression and prejudice.

A generation ago, it may have been enough for the Negro to ask for the right to enter a restaurant.

But today the Negro American asks:

Is my life better? Are my children attending better schools? Do I hold a better job—or any job? Do I have a voice in the life of my city and my neighborhood? Am I a first-class citizen—a man among men, in my own eyes and in the eyes of my family?

Until a man can truthfully answer "yes" to these questions, we should not expect him to consider the battle won or the struggle ended. And neither should we.

For what is left for such a man when the dust of the march has settled?

Where today the slogans of a better world spring from his lips, tomorrow there may be nothing but the taste of ashes.

So, precisely at a time when the civil rights movement has achieved its most stirring victories, the revolution of rising expectations demands that we turn now to confront the work which remains.

It is one thing to cry "freedom now" on a picket line. But it is another to achieve true freedom in the squalid world of the ghetto—where generations of exploitation have produced problems which no man can overcome in a day, week, or year—where we see and feel the devastating impact of that tragic equation which has too often decreed that poor shall beget poor and ignorance shall beget misery.

It is one thing to demand the federal government to meet its growing responsibilities in civil rights. But it is another to generate in our states and localities the commitment and urgency required to produce significant improvement in the lives of people.

And it is one thing to overcome flagrant examples of racial prejudice—segregated hotels, buses and parks. But it is another to eliminate the more subtle and sophisticated techniques which effectively restrict true freedom of choice in jobs, education and housing.

Now we must combine an acute sense of urgency with a heightened understanding of the complexity of the remaining civil rights problems. We must balance dedication to action with commitment to achievement.

We must understand there are no easy answers, no instant solutions, to problems generations in the making.

But there are certain problems demanding priority attention as we strive to translate legal promises of equality and freedom into reality.

First, the federal government accepts the job of meeting its growing responsibilities.

One of those responsibilities is to press for legislation to fulfill the promise of the Constitution. You know what this Administration is doing on Capitol Hill to discharge that responsibility—and we need your support urgently if the Civil Rights Act of 1966 is to become law.

There are other responsibilities as well. And one of these is to see that programs financed by all of the people—black and white—shall not be operated to benefit only part of the people.

Last Friday a new day of security and well-being dawned for the senior citizens of this country—the long-awaited program of medicare went into effect.

But another revolution took place simultaneously—a revolution in medical facilities available to Negro Americans and other minorities.

Acting with a clear mandate from Congress, the federal government directed that hospitals could only participate in the medicare program if they provided non-segregated facilities and medical service to persons of all ages.

More than 92 per cent of our hospitals met these standards on July 1—and many of these hospitals were previously segregated. I predict the large majority of those not in compliance will be in the near future.

One fact is certain: the funds for medicare and other federally-assisted facilities are collected without regard to race, color or creed—the benefits, therefore, must and will be available on the same basis.

Secondly, there exists an urgent need for new initiatives and responsibility in civil rights matters by our states and local governments.

The battle against slumism and poverty must be waged primarily in our local communities—with assistance from the states and federal government.

The struggle to provide quality education for all the children of America must go forward in our localities—again with assistance from the states and federal government.

The job of achieving meaningful choice for all persons in the sale and rental of housing must be accomplished in our cities.

The federal government is fully prepared to play a major role in this process. But the impact of this federal assistance is magnified a thousand-fold if a community is fully committed to the goal of decent, non-segregated housing for all its citizens—if a community is developing creative, bold new approaches to meet the housing crises of urban and rural America.

The vital task of building a system of justice which treats all men alike—black and white, rich and poor—must be carried out in our cities and towns.

"Equal justice under law" is more than slogan etched over the entrance of the Supreme Court. It is the foundation of our entire democratic system of government.

The Supreme Court has reiterated the need to inform all arrested persons of their right to counsel—of their right not to testify against themselves—and of their right to prompt arraignment before a magistrate.

These decisions—reaffirming some of our fundamental notions of justice in a free society—should be applauded by every American—and implemented by every community.

For in the final analysis, the responsibility for securing equality before the law is a shared responsibility. The judical, as the legislative and executive branches, has thus posed a challenge to all Americans.

How do we replace the old argument over states' rights with the more meaningful development of states' responsibilities . . . and the responsibilities of communities, and organizations, and individuals?

There is difficult, unglamorous, back-breaking, heartbreaking, day-to-day work ahead in every ghetto . . . every election district . . . and every school district—for only there can our lofty goals and promises be redeemed

We know the NAACP has been doing this work in countless cities and towns across America. Yes, long ago you made the decision to stay in your communities and do the work that had to be done.

We salute you for this decision.

Yes, I applaud those who left their everyday pursuits to be part of the new birth of freedom taking place in the South.

But I also applaud and honor those who will remain in those towns after the fever pitch of the moment has passed. Theirs is the long and arduous task of converting apathy to conviction—of translating ardor into achievement.

We should strive to do these things because they are proper and just . . . because we have the moral obligation to match our promises with performances and to reward faith with fulfillment.

But we should also do them because this nation will know little tranquility and peace until all Americans have an opportunity to share in her well-being.

We must understand that now the question is not whether all men shall have a full measure of freedom and justice, but how it shall be provided.

Thirdly, we must enlist new allies in our struggle against discrimination and derivation—from business, labor, religious and community groups.

We know that in recent years impressive strides have been made by both business and labor in rooting out blatant forms of job discrimination based on race or color.

The next phase of the battle will be less dramatic, and it will attract a smaller number of those interested in the simple issues and the easy victories. Yet this next phase—one of the nuts and bolts of the expansion of employment opportunities—is vital.

Outmoded training programs, biased testing and recruitment procedures, apprenticeship requirements and promotion patterns can deny equal employment opportunity as effectively as the old fashioned "white only" classified ads.

We must take vigorous affirmative action through skillfully designed training programs to help compensate persons who have been denied all opportunity to prepare themselves for today's job market.

We must give special attention to working out equitable procedures so that arrest records, juvenile offenses, and lack of a high school diploma are not permanent barriers to employment where a person has otherwise established his trustworthiness and ability.

Federal departments and agencies are now sponsoring a number of innovative programs so that equal employment opportunity will exist in fact, as well as in law. Private industry must be more willing to exeriment as we seek workable solutions to these knotty problems.

The time has come to broaden the base of the civil rights movement . . . to reach out into the community and enlist vital new sources of energy and strength.

Here the NAACP has an especially important role to play. You have traditionally sought close cooperation among churches, labor unions, business groups, and service clubs. We must now reach out even further with the message: "Brother, we need you for freedom."

This appeal cuts to the core of those questions of philosophy and of strategy which currently engaged the civil rights movement.

It seems to me fundamental that we cannot embrace the dogma of the oppressors—the notion that somehow a person's skin color determines his worthiness or unworthiness.

Yes, racism is racism—and there is no room in America for racism of any color.

And we must reject calls for racism, whether they come from a throat that is white or one that is black.

Legitimate pride in the achievements and contributions of one's forebears is, of course, another matter. One of the great tragedies of America has been that so few persons—white or black—appreciate the remarkable contributions of Negroes to this nation's history.

How many of us, for example, know that 26 of the 44 settlers who established this city of Los Angeles in 1781 were Negroes?

But pride in Negro history and achievement should establish a basis upon which to build a new climate of mutual respect among all elements of society—not false doctrines of racial superiority. We must strive to create a society in which the aims of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the civil rights movement can be achieved. And, always remember, we seek *advancement* . . . not *apartheid*.

Negroes have been a part of America since Jamestown. They suffered—and survived—the cruel yoke of slavery. They have experienced hardship and discrimination of a severity and duration that no group of Americans has known. And the basis for this brutality has been segregation and exclusion—on terms imposed by the white majority.

Today this system is being torn down through the concerted efforts of both white and Negroes. We must strive to perfect one citizenship, one destiny for all Americans.

Integration must be recognized as an essential *means* to the *ends* we are seeking—the ends of freedom, justice and equal opportunity for all Americans.

And if there are areas in this country where meaningful integration is not a realistic prospect—as there are, in both the South and the North—then the true remedy lies in creating these conditions as quickly as possible.

As President Johnson said in his historic address at Howard University, "In far too many ways American Negroes have been another nation: deprived of freedom, crippled by hatred, the doors of opportunity closed to hope."

Who, in similar circumstances, might not feel within him the responsive echo to the cries of power and hostile pride?

Who, in similar circumstances, might not finally lose faith and patience with statements of good intention which were seldom translated into action?

Our response to these cries of outrage and despair must be hard, visible evidence—evidence that a man can see and feel and measure in his city . . . his job . . . his home . . . his children . . . his own sense of dignity and self-respect.

Today, after far too long, we are beginning to see that evidence. The road to freedom has been obscured far too many years by hatred and habit, by anger and apathy. But it now lies clearly in view.

We march down that road not in separate columns to the sound of martial music heralding the approach of clashing armies.

We march, instead, together—to the sound of a song echoed by free people everywhere, of all colors, of all races, in every land:

"Stony the road we trod . . .
Bitter the chastening rod . . .
Facing the rising sun of our new day begun . . .
Let us, together, hand-in-hand, march on till victory is won . . ."

The "Hoosier Wing" Excels Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial commending the "do it" spirit of the 434th Troop Carrier Wing, Air Force Reserve, at Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus, Ind.

This excellent editorial, which appears in the May issue of Strike, the official newsletter of the U.S. Strike Command, recognizes the competitive, determined spirit of the Hoosier Air Force Reserve wing despite an impending order to deactivate this outstanding unit.

Brig. Gen. John W. Hoff, commander of the wing, has maintained top efficiency, combat readiness, and unwavering esprit de corps in this uncertain time for the wing.

The editorial deals with the unit's perfection of the "slingshot" method of extracting airborne supplies accurately and quickly over a given area.

This is but one more feather in the caps of the men of the 434th, which has an outstanding record in peace and in war.

The editorial and a story follow:

THE "DO IT" SPIRIT

If any accolades are to be passed out, it seems the 434th Troop Carrier Wing, an Air Force Reserve unit at Bakalar AFB, Ind., has earned them.

The unit, commanded by Brig. Gen. John W. Hoff, has perfected the "slingshot" method of extracting supplies from the C–119G more quickly and accurately.

General Hoff briefed the staff at Headquarters, U.S. Strike Command and introduced a documentary film showing how the 434th refined method works.

As a result, the outfit has been invited to demonstrate the "slingshot" technique for Strike Command in the field.

The 434th flies the C–119G twin-engine twin-boom, "Flying Boxcar" found now only in reserve airlift wings. The ground and aircrews of these aircraft continually provide airlift support for the Air Force. One day they may be dropping or resupplying 82nd or 101st Airborne Division paratroopers in a local mission and the next day hauling supplies across the United States. Seven days a week the 434th has two crews flying airlift missions.

Obviously, their interest doesn't end with providing aerial logistics in a professional manner. The C–119 is one of the oldest aircraft in the airlift business and the unit's attitude "How can we do the job better" is certainly worth praising.

EXTRACTS CONTAINERS IN SECONDS AND ACCURATELY: C–119 CREW USES "SLINGSHOT"

(By M. Sgt. John Renneker)

Dropping supplies from the air and getting them to land close to troops on the ground is a problem that the Services have been trying to solve for years.

Methods and techniques have improved over the years, especially since more emphasis has been placed on aerial delivery.

The 434th Troop Carrier Wing, an Air Force Continental Air Command Reserve unit, commanded by Brig. Gen. John W. Hoff at Bakalar AFB, Ind., has devised a "slingshot" method of extracting containers from the C–119G in seconds and accurately.

The 433rd Troop Carrier Wing at Kelly AFB, Tex., also a reserve unit, had previously experimented with the slingshot technique but it didn't catch on for cargo delivery. The 434th's technique is an improvement on the earlier method.

In a maximum load extraction, 52 A–21 containers with a total weight of 17,500 pounds were extracted in 4.5 seconds from the C–119. All the supplies landed within a rectangle of less than 275 by 30 yards. The first load landed a mere 14 yards from the designated impact point. The drop was made from 400 feet. Containers were equipped with G–13 parachutes, deployed by static lines.

In another demonstration, the twin-engine aircraft dropped 15 heavy A–22 containers with a total weight of 22,800 pounds on a single pass from 700 feet. The first load landed nine yards from the impact point. The 15 containers landed in an overall area 225 yards long and 20 yards wide. For the A–22 container, the G–12D parachute was used.

The impressive slingshot technique calls for seven basic components—monorail with trolley cable, spreader bar, pulleys, nylon strap, winch and a highpowered motor.

Secured to the center of the roof is a monorail with a trolley that moves from the rear to the front of the cargo compartment.

Attached to the trolley's clevis are two cables that go to pulleys on the sides and rear of the compartment area. The cables are separated by a seven-foot spread bar to prevent the cables tangling during cargo extraction.

At the rear pulleys, the cables practically do an about face and stretch to the forward part of the compartment where they are attached to a nylon belt. The nylon belt encircles the cargo containers along the "waistline" of the load.

When the aircraft reaches the computed release point, the navigator flips a switch and the high-powered motor activates the winch which pulls the trolley forward on the monorail, whisking the containers rapidly over the conveyor rollers to the open rear end of the cargo hold.

As the containers are thus "slingshotted" out of the fuselage, static lines deploy each container's parachute.

Freedom From Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEN B. JORDAN

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, a great new era of progressive development is dawning for my home State of Idaho. But the process of change which is everywhere apparent in the State is also requiring Idahoans to face many of the problems which have become major crises in more heavily populated areas. The attitude and energy of the people in meeting these challenges are, of course, of vital importance.

On June 25, Eugene C. Dorsey, publisher of the Idaho Statesman, addressed himself to this matter in a perceptive and thought-provoking speech to the Idaho State Chamber of Commerce regional meeting in Idaho Falls. His remarks were directed to Idahoans but his basic analysis has a broad application to all Americans. So that my colleagues might have the benefit of his exposition concerning freedom from responsibility, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be included in the appendix of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM FROM RESPONSIBILITY

(By Eugene C. Dorsey, Idaho State Chamber of Commerce, regional meeting, June 25, 1966, Idaho Falls, Idaho)

"We've been laying a lot of emphasis for 30 years on freedom from want, freedom from disease, freedom from poverty, freedom from fear . . . now we've got to the point where we are approaching freedom from responsibility."

That's Red Motley talking. Red, as most of you know, has served in a series of National Chamber of Commerce offices. At the 54th Annual Meeting of the U.S. Chamber, Red spoke at the Challenge Luncheon.

He said, "There have been 'Great Societies' in the past. This is not a modern invention. But when these societies arrived at freedom from responsibility, they ceased to be 'Great Societies.' "

Other contemporary writers and thinkers have offered similar observations. Editor of the Tulsa, Oklahoma Tribune and syndicated columnist Jenkin Jones has said, "When nations cease believing in themselves, when they regard their institutions with cynicism and their traditions with flippancy, they will not long remain great nations." Will Durant in his Story of Civilization wrote, "A great civilization is not conquered from without until it has destroyed itself within. The essential causes of Rome's decline lay in her people, her morals, her class struggle, her failing bureaucratic despotism, her stifling taxes, her consuming wars."

Jenkins Jones developed a Jeremiad along these lines. He expressed alarm at the mounting evidence of moral decay. He pointed to the degeneration of our movies, the violence depicted on our television screens, the crudeness of our literature, the confusion of our art. He deplored expense account cheating, learning without effort, wages without work and excessive permissiveness with our children. He said, "There are no lazy bums anymore, only deprived persons. It is impolite to speak of thugs, they are underprivileged. Yet the swaggering duck-tailed young men who boldly flaunt their gang symbols on their motorcycle jackets are far more blessed in creature comforts, opportunities for advancement and freedom from drudgery than 90% of the children of the world. We have sown the dragon's teeth and out of the ground has sprung the legion bearing switchblade knives and bicycle chains. Clearly something is missing. Could it be what the rest of the world's children have been given, the doctrine of individual responsibility?"

Mr. Jones has selected a rather shocking method for making his point. I think we should all be disturbed by the signs of flabbiness and decay which he sees. I am not prepared to dismiss the influence of environment and circumstances on people but I enthusiastically endorse his call for the exercise of the doctrine of individual responsibility. How we apply it then becomes the critical issue. Righteous indignation is good for the soul. I get aroused by the callow and spineless who say, "It's a world we never made." But is this some kind of license for abandoning all efforts to improve our lot and set right what it wrong? Organizations such as this one have established commendable records for reducing problems to bite size and going to work on them. Their activities stand pretty tall against the whimpering crys of hopelessness that issue from the pitiable masses of the do-nothing derelicts of our society.

Dissenting voices are needed at all times. Voices of restraint, caution and counsel. Being a newspaper man I would be hard-pressed not to condone criticism. But the wise critics haven't resorted to carrying signs, writing four letter words on walls or burning draft cards. Unfortunately, many dissenting voices are that and nothing more. They offer no alternatives for positive action. They're just agin'ers without ever deciding what they are for.

At this point in time, such attitudes will be of little service. And here, I am not referring to the responsible comments of Red Motley and Jenkin Jones. I mean the fearful dissenters who are not solving the problems but becoming part of them. Our tremendous progress has untapped a gushing well-spring of dilemmas. The outpouring will either engulf us or be harnessed to the everlasting benefit of mankind. We recognize problems of gigantic dimensions but view with skepticism massive governmental efforts to solve them. But the alternative is not to do nothing. The growing needs of an expanding society will not be ignored. We must involve ourselves in the problems, minimize the cost of solutions in terms of money, time and freedom. For example, a failure to recognize the need to train a growing mass of displaced workers, will only result in a costly toll in crime and unemployment payments. To deplore the expanding relief rolls without an effort to make recipients productive employees is futile.

In a Wednesday morning editorial, The Idaho Daily Statesman quoted Ronald Regan, California gubernatorial candidate. He said, "We can't accept the negative philosophy of those who would close their eyes, hoping the problems will disappear, or that questions of unemployment, inequality of opportunity, or the needs of the elderly and sick will take care of themselves. But neither should we submit unquestioningly to those others whose only solution is abdication of personal and local responsibility as they pass the problems on to the federal government." I think that says it very well.

I'm not as concerned about the bearded prophets in Times Square carrying signs proclaiming that the world will end tomorrow as I am by Idahoans whose actions indicate they believe the world ended yesterday. They just aren't seeing the right signs.

Next weekend, The Statesmen will print a 76-page supplement to our Sunday paper called "Here We Have Idaho." It will be filled with information that will warm the heart of any good chamber of commerce man. For example, acording to El Roy Nelson, Vice-President and Economist for First Security Corporation, Idaho continues to rank among the 10 leading states in busines expansion. Population has exceeded 700,000. Employment exceeded 260,000 by April or some 10,2000 above a year ago. Personal income for the first months of the year is 10 percent ahead of last year. Average weekly earnings are running 4% above a year ago. Capital expenditures in the state will establish new records. "To most observers," Mr. Nelson says, "increases in business, manufacturing, and in all major segments of the state's economy suggest an increasing role in the nation's economy."

Idaho is in a favored position. It is not yet afflicted with many of the problems of urban areas. With strong initiative at local and state levels proper planning can help us bridge many of the quagmires other sectors find themselves in.

This isn't the first age to face baffling and bewildering circumstances.

One thousand years ago, engulfed in despair, people struggled in the wake of the Roman Empire collapse. Roads were overgrown, bridges broken, walled cities fallen in. Disease lurked in many quarters. Precious marble statues were being ground to produce lime to plaster their hovels, hovels built into the walls that were once part of the palaces of the Caesars. Five hundred years ago, we had the age of witches. Gaping crowds crossed themselves against the evil eye as poor old crones died screaming in the faggots on market day. And men and women fled to the monasteries and convents, convinced that worldly life was meaningless and retreat from man the only answer.

One hundred years ago, preachers all over the South were still proclaiming that human slavery was part of God's plan. The nation was churned with hatred and one third of it lay in ruins. Children labored in the factories 12 hours a day. The graveyards were filled with young victims of whooping cough. The lower Mississippi was a pest house of malaria and yellow fever. Thousands were agreeing with David Thoreau that the steam locomotive and the electric telegraph had made life so complicated that the wise man must take to the woods and live in solitude.

In his book, "The Changing World," Jenken Jones offers these observations for those today who would shrink from the complexities of our world. He says, "The cynics never rubbed King John's nose in the Magna Carta or established the British Common Law and the Rights of Man. The hopeless didn't ferret out the secrets of disease, the laws of sanitation and thus enable millions of children to bypass the graveyards. The runners-and-hiders from reality have done nothing to relieve the famines, to temper the injustices, to ease the drudgery of mankind. . . . Sure, we stand in the shadow of the H-bomb. Sure, we are approaching the day when one madman, conceivably, could press a button that would turn the earth into a scorched, dead moon. This is a problem that we must master, and we don't have too much time. If you would keep your spirits high and your perspective clear, pause long enough to look back along the road we've traveled. We've come a long, long way."

Yes, we've come a long, long way and we have a long way to go. But with the application of some ageless virtues to the problems of a new age, we will nudge the course of history into another era bright with achievement but shadowed as always with predictions of imminent doom. Charles Brower, the articulate president of a famous New York advertising agency, has reflected on some of these ancient virtues in an essay he wrote on the word "Square". He said, "Square", another of the good old words has gone the way of "love", and "modesty" and "Patriotism." Something to be smirked over or laughed at outright. It used to be that there was no higher compliment you could pay a person than to call him a "square shooter." The salesman's promise of a "square deal" once was as binding as an oath on the Bible. But today a square is a man who volunteers when he doesn't have to. He is a man who gets his kicks from doing a better job than anyone else. He is a boob who gets so lost in his work he has to be reminded that it's time to go home.

A square is a guy who lives within his means whether the Joneses do or not. He doesn't want to fly now and pay later. A square is likely to save some of his own money for a rainy day, rather than count on using yours.

A square is a guy who reads scripture when nobody's watching and prays when nobody's listening. A guy who thinks Christmas trees should be green and Christmas gifts should be hand picked. He wants to see America first—in everything.

He believes in honoring Father and Mother and "do unto others" and that kind of stuff. He thinks he knows more than his teenager knows about cars, freedom and curfew. He tells his son it's more important to play fair than to win.

You misfits in this brave new age, you disorganized, improperly apologetic ghosts of the past, stand up! Stand up and be counted! You squares who turn the wheels and dig the fields and move mountains and put rivers in our dreams. You squares who dignify the human race, you squares who hold the thankless world in place.

It's a great time to be alive in Idaho. The opportunities to adorn our cities and state with achievement are unlimited. It's understandable that many do not want to see the state change—it's a tribute to the high regard in which they hold it. But the onrushing tide of progress will bring its own reward and help us, a people, to fulfill our responsibility to the advancement of the nation.

Red Motley again. "This country itself is here today because volunteers stood at Lexington and Concord. Plenty of their neighbors didn't stand with them; didn't want to get involved. They sat it out. But the colonists who believed in freedom—the volunteers—made this country possible. There wasn't any organized government. There wasn't even an organized army in the beginning—just volunteers—following their own individual star where they lived, making the necessary sacrifice."

The next chapter in the history of Idaho is being written. Are we going to sit it out? Are we going to excuse ourselves because someone else isn't doing what he should? Or will our state feel the impact of our individual responsibility.

The state song says, "Here We Have Idaho." Now, what are we going to do for it?

First Aid Squad—Pompton Lakes, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a demonstration program conducted by the Pompton Lakes First Aid Squad in the congressional district which I represent. This demonstration program shows techniques which prevent paralysis resulting from swimming accidents and especially from diving injuries.

A "diving injury team" of the Pompton Lakes First Aid Squad is performing a valuable public service, going around the New Jersey and Middle East area to demonstrate methods of preventing paralysis. Cervical spine injuries are often aggravated or even caused by persons attempting to help victims of diving accidents. By their demonstration programs, the Pompton Lakes First Aid Squad shows how simple it is to provide against such injuries.

The program has been presented in schools, to scout troops, at civic and community service clubs and to groups assembled at private pools who have requested the demonstration.

Each member of the diving injury team devotes a great deal of time to program particularly Al Snyder, chief narrator; Arthur Heimall, chief instructor; and Mrs. June Hepworth, its chairman, but all feel that if their efforts prevent even one serious injury the time invested is well spent.

Other members of the team are Casey Jones, Heinz Suhl, Ed Janowski, Hans Frese, Murray Goldberg, Jack Quinn, Bob Carroll, Joseph Hepworth, Jessie Snyder, Dot Reardon, Pat Rathburn, and Rose Rhinesmith.

Working with the group are four children who have been trained to act as victims in actual demonstrations and have also posed for the slides used in presentation of the program where a pool is not available. They are Debbie Jones, Karen Carroll, Ken Crane, Jr., John Quinn, Jr., and Ron Houser.

These public-spirited people give their service free of charge and are so dedicated that they are willing to go anywhere, even beyond the Midatlantic States area, to conduct demonstrations. I am proud to be the Congressman of such dedicated people.

Seventh Annual "Vermont Shipmate Company" Ceremonies, Burlington, Vt., June 25, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on June 25 of this year, in Burlington, Vt., the Albany Navy Recruiting District Headquarters had its seventh annual "Vermont Shipmate Company" ceremonies.

At this time, the Navy publicly swore in almost 100 young men from throughout Vermont.

The main speeches were delivered by Capt. C. H. Sewall, deputy chief of staff for Naval Reserve, First Naval District in Boston, and by the Honorable William B. Franke, who served our country so well as Secretary of the Navy under President Eisenhower.

I ask unanimous consent that these two short speeches be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY CAPTAIN CHARLES H. SEWALL

Thank you, Commander Kennedy, shipmates, your parents, relatives and friends, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

You young men who have just taken the first step toward becoming sailors are those whom we honor today. As I look at you this morning, I know that some of you will become leaders in the Navy, and that others will become leaders in civilian life after you have finished your active duty. Each of you will be faced with challenges during the next few months and years. I urge you to meet them head-on, and not slide around them with the false hope that somehow they will go away. All rivers, and most men, follow the course of least resistance. The leaders among you will channel their lives toward making the hard decision rather than taking the easy way.

Today, many young men seem to be objecting to the way in which we older people are running the country. I feel that most of these dissenters do not offer constructive ideas, and that they are blind to the dangers of destructive criticism. Our system can always be improved, but to tear down the principles upon which it is based will result in anarchy. These dissenters want to enjoy the harvest without the labor. I also feel that they do not always realize that American freedom was not won easily, and that it cannot be preserved easily. Keeping America free requires men and women of every generation who remain true to American ideals and principles when the going is rough, and who value freedom more than life.

Arnold Bennett once said: "No one can possibly be satisfied, or happy, who feels that in some paramount affair he has failed to take up the challenge of life. For a voice within him, which no one else can hear, but which he cannot choke, will constantly be murmuring: 'You lacked courage. You ran away.' It is happier to be unhappy in the ordinary sense than to have to listen to the end of one's life to that dreadful interior verdict."

America is proud of its heroes who, from colonial days, have filled our history books, and she is proud of the many young men and women who are preserving freedom today. Each of them who shows devotion to duty and country has the potential of being a hero and a leader.

You young men, by your allegiance to the United States and the Navy, are keeping faith with those who strove in the past to assure a future of freedom for America. Vermont has an enviable reputation for its quiet, unyielding determination in preserving freedom, ever since the days of the French and Indian wars two hundred years ago. You men are now a part of that reputation, and will be a part of the history of Vermont and America. I have every confidence that with men like you in the United States Navy, our country will be in good hands. I wish you not simply a fair wind and a following sea in your careers, but also many challenges, for your success in meeting them will make you the leaders that are essential to Vermont, to the Navy, to the United States.

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE WILLIAM B. FRANKE

Lieutenant Commander Bauer, Captain Sewall, Lieutenant Commander Kennedy, distinguished guests, and particularly members of the 1966 Vermont Shipmate Company and their parents, relatives and friends to whom these remarks are addressed:

Once again I am privileged to be present at a Vermont Shipmate Company ceremony. As a former Secretary of our wonderful Navy, it gives me great pleasure and pride to welcome into our Navy the members of this year's shipmate company. I will predict that, whether or not you make the Navy a career, you will always look back upon your period of service as being the greatest and most rewarding experience of your lives, for everyone who has ever been part of this superb service comes to love it. By way of example, I can tell you that, although I have been out of the Navy five years, I still miss it.

In recent weeks two Vermont mothers, whose sons have received draft calls, have told me that their sons are unwilling to enter a military service and that they must therefore be unpatriotic. I don't believe this. I think that the reluctance of these young men, whose mothers call them unpatriotic, stems from the fact that they are bewildered and cannot understand why we are fighting a war in a far-off, small country called Vietnam.

Perhaps some of you, who have volunteered for military service may also share this feeling of bewilderment.

Not enough has been said as to why we are fighting in Vietnam, and to explain it fully would consume more time than you would be willing to give me. But I would like to tell you in as few words as possible why I support the war in Vietnam even though I may not wholly agree with the extent of our efforts or the manner in which we are conducting this war.

Both the Soviet Union and Communist China intend that communism shall dominate the world and, as Hitler did, they have repeatedly said so. You must realize that North Vietnam, a small country, could not continue its agressive penetration into South Vietnam without heavy support from both the Soviet Union and Communist China. This penetration is part of the whole Communist scheme and is done with the hope that we will abandon South Vietnam and thereby subject all of the free people of southeast Asia to Communist domination. It is obvious that this would be inimical to our national interests and security as well as to the interests of the free people of Asia and that if we abandon South Vietnam, we will have weakened ourselves in the eyes of the world but, even worse, that we will have stimulated the hopes of the Communists for world domination. This can only lead to further attempts at an early date and, perhaps, under even more unfavorable circumstances and closer to home.

General Giap, North Vietnam's defense minister and an expert on guerrilla warfare has stated the issue bluntly:

"South Vietnam," he said, "Is the model of the National Liberation Movement of our time . . . if the special warfare that the United States Imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated anywhere in the world."

It is pertinent to ask ourselves, "Why does North Vietnam continue this war?" Certainly an examination of the relative power available to South Vietnam and the United States, and that available to North Vietnam and its Communist allies, clearly indicates that North Vietnam cannot hope to succeed in its efforts to conquer South Vietnam as long as both sides continue to fight.

Admiral Arleigh Burke, Former Chief of Naval Operations, in a recent appearance before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific, mentions three possible reasons why North Vietman is continuing this war.

The first is that they hope for a spectacular military disaster to some elements of the United States and Allied Forces now in South Vietnam, with the result that the people and the Government of the United States would be so shaken that they would withdraw our remaining military forces supporting South Vietnam. This possibility is, I believe, remote.

The second and more probable possibility is rooted in the history of Vietnam. The Vietnamese fought against the French for Years. After years of what seemed like a hopeless struggle, they eventually defeated the French on the battlefield at Dien Bien Phu. This battle had great significance for two reasons, first because a European Army was defeated by an oriental army and, second because a modern European Army equipped with modern weapons was defeated by indigenous forces largely equipped with obsolete or captured weapons. But as has been pointed out by many writers, the French campaign in Indochina failed not primarily because of combat conditions but because the French Government and the French people had lost their will to resist the Communist take-out in the Far East.

The third possibility is that the North Vietnamese may be convinced that the United States will eventually negotiate on their terms, with perhaps some face-saving device for the United States and our allies. I do not believe despite all the public demonstrations and the statements of many prominent citizens of the United States, that the people of our country and our Government will be willing to accept Communist domination of all southeast Asia in the name of "Peace".

We don't want this war but certainly we don't want to surrender the world to communism. And that is the issue. We either stop Communist aggression in southeast Asia or we create another impenetrable Iron Curtain and shrink the free world still further. If this shrinkage is allowed to continue, our way or life, as we know it, will disappear and all of the ideals and accomplishments of this great country of ours will disappear with it.

And so, in closing, if any of you who are members of the 1966 Vermont Shipmate Company should find yourselves on a Navy ship or in a Navy aircraft off the shores of Daigon or Hanoi or any other part of Vietnam, I hope you will remember that you are engaged in a war to preserve not only the freedom of the people of southeast Asia but our freedom as well.

New Zealand: Red China Is the Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my studies of interoceanic canal problems and world power politics over the past decade with reference to the control of strategic maritime transportation routes, I have been increasingly impressed with the crucial importance of the Malay Barrier extending from India to the New Hebrides. Since Australia and New Zealand are extensions of this barrier separating the Pacific and Indian Oceans, their security is also vital in the maintenance of world stability.

For a brilliant discussion of the Malay Barrier in time of major war, attention is invited to the book, "MacArthur 1941–51," by Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, and John Chamberlain, published in 1954 by McGraw-Hill Book Co.

The present war in Vietnam is more significant than appears from daily press dispatches, for it is obvious that Red power is following the old Japanese war plan for gaining control of the strategic resources of southeast Asia and bases for further extension of conquest along the line of the Malay Barrier. In fact, their program appears to be a warmed-over version for an East Asia coprosperity sphere.

It was, therefore, with the greatest interest that I read in the June 19, 1966, issue of the New York Times a special dispatch from New Zealand summarizing a major review to the Parliament of that country of long-range planning for its defense.

In order that the indicated news story may be brought to the attention of the Congress and of the cognizant agencies of the executive branch of our Government, I quote it as part of my remarks:

TO NEW ZEALAND, COMMUNIST CHINA IS THE THREAT

AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND, June 18.—The greatest threat to New Zealand's interests and security in the 1970's and beyond comes from the growing power of Communist China, in the opinion of the New Zealand Government. This danger is emphasized as a basic consideration in defense planning in a major review setting up guidelines for policy in the years ahead.

The review, presented to Parliament, stresses collective defense as the only possible basis for New Zealand security. It completely rejects neutralism or isolationism as acceptable foundations for national policy.

DANGER AREA SHIFTS

The review acknowledges that in 1966 the international outlook is largely overshadowed by the struggle in Vietnam, and it declares that changes in the world scene, bringing the greatest dangers to the Pacific rather than the Atlantic, have worked to the disadvantages of New Zealand.

Already, 12 per cent of New Zealand's regular forces are committed in Southeast Asia—in Malaysia, South Vietnam and Thailand.

In the longer term, the Government says, planning is based on the belief that Southeast Asia will continue to be a disturbed and unstable area up to 1970 and indeed through the seventies.

The major threat is specified as "Communist China's active role as the 'exporter of revolution' throughout the area."

The Government believes there is likely to be a slow deterioration in stability and security over the period which could lead to increasing New Zealand's involvement in the military as well as political problems of the area.

The review says:

"In certain situations, such as the massive confrontation between Communist and Western-supported forces in South Vietnam, it is possible that hostilities involving New Zealand and her allies could be on a scale requiring a major effort on our part."

The review lists among objectives in maintaining national security:

"To establish a claim upon our major allies for consultation, a voice in important decisions, and, in the last resort and most importantly, military assistance and protection in time of need. This requires New Zealand to demonstrate willingness to make an appropriate degree of national defensive effort, and willingness and ability to assist our allies in matters affecting their national interests."

The cost of modern weapons systems makes it impossible for a small country such as New Zealand to sustain a capability in more than a few selected roles, the review said. Accordingly, it added, it is necessary to choose forces most able to fit flexibly into operations with New Zealand's allies.

In the short term, until 1970, the Government envisages the following roles for its military services:

For the navy, anti-submarine and escort work with fast frigates;

For the army, ground contribution in Southeast Asia by means of an infantry battalion, paratroop detachment and an artillery battery, backed by a combat brigade group in New Zealand but prepared for overseas service;

For the air force, close air-support operations (for ground attack), transport, and maritime surveillance and antisubmarine operations.

William Forrest Foster—Horatio Alger Award Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, William Forrest Foster, an eminent industrialist from Mayfield, Ky., has been named a Horatio Alger Award winner. He went to work as a $5-a-week office boy in business and started life in a Graves County log-cabin home.

He became president of Merit Clothing Co. in 1942 and his firm now has more than 2,000 employees.

He is a civic planner and a civic worker as well as an industrial leader, distinguished citizen, and leader of Kentucky, and I ask unanimous consent that these remarks about him which appeared in the Mayfield Messenger upon the occasion of his award, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

One of the best known men in Kentucky, as industrial leader and civic planner, will receive the Horatio Alger Award May 23 in New York. He is William Forrest Foster, president of Merit Clothing Company of Mayfield. The Horatio Alger Awards Committee selected him for the honor in recognition of his rise from an office boy's $5-a-week to the presidency of one of America's largest men's clothing manufacturers, and of his eminence as a civic leader.

The twelve annual winners of the Horatio Alger Award are chosen out of a group of several hundred national leaders, nominated by their own community organizations. After screening by the Awards Committee, the final selection is made by a panel of 3,000 college students representing some 500 colleges and universities.

In its citation of Foster to receive the award, the committee took special note of his ascent in the true Horatio Alger tradition. Born in a log cabin on a Graves County, Kentucky, farm, Foster first showed his devotion to hard work by completing a one-year business course in six months. Immediately thereafter he started his business career as office boy-janitor for W. H. Brizendine, then the Merit Clothing Company's general manager.

Within a short time young Foster became Mr. Brizendine's secretary. From that point his rise in the Merit organization was rapid. In 1942 he was elected President of the company—the position he still holds.

Foster's career has been marked throughout by an unusual approach to business—always with emphasis on human relations. He is personally acquainted with most of his company's more than 2,000 employees. More than once he has been appealed to as arbiter of their personal problems. Foster is also one of the few company presidents on record to invite a union to organize his company's workers. He made the move in the face of strong opposition, but the fine labor relations record at Merit demonstrates the value of the decision.

Foster is known all over Kentucky for his interest in civic affairs. One of his most famous civic achievements was the drive to build a War Memorial at Mayfield. Thanks to Foster's careful planning and evangelical appeal, Mayfield citizens pledged $200,000 the first day, and brought the figure up to $300,000 in record time.

As part of his dedication to public service, Foster has been active in politics. His support has been a decisive factor in several gubernatorial victories. However, he has steadily refused to stand for public office.

The Horatio Alger Award has been sponsored for the last 19 years by the American Schools and Colleges Association, whose national chairman is Dr. Norman Vincent Peale. Its Awards Committee annually receives nominations of several hundred Americans whose careers typify the results of individual initiative, hard work, honesty and high standards of conduct. These names are first screened by the committee. Some twenty names are then presented about 3,000 undergraduates at more than 500 American colleges and universities. The students elect the twelve men who, in their opinion, best reflect the spirit of achievement in the face of handicaps.

In asking these young men and women to select the Horatio Alger Award winners, the Committee seeks to demonstrate to them the truth of its motto: "Opportunity Still Knocks." Studying the careers of the nominees, the students see proof that the basic principles of American free enterprise still lead to success in a material sense and in a real service to the community. Their election is based on their judgment of the records of the nominees.

Foster and his wife, Mrs. Katie Foster, and son, Charles Foster, reside on Foster Lane at a beautiful farm two miles southeast of Mayfield.

The president of the non-profit Horatio Alger Awards Committee of the American Schools and Colleges Association, Inc., Kenneth J. Beebe said, "Your life is an inspiring demonstration of our country as a land of opportunity for those whose brains, courage and faith have triumphed over obstacles."

Governor Edward T. Breathitt had this to say, "Mr. Foster's life parallels the 'rags to riches' stories. The higher he has climbed on the ladder to various successes the more he has done for his fellowmen. The name 'Mr. Willie' to the people of his home area means help and comfort to all with whom he is associated. His name on the state and national level means success in whatever his undertaking might me."

Mr. Foster and Mrs. Foster, their son Charles, and several other Mayfieldians will attend the award dinner in New York City on Monday, May 23, to receive this high honor to be presented by Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, the national chairman of the association.

This will be the 20th annual Bronze Plaque Award dinner of the association.

W. F. Foster is one of the twelve prominent Americans, poor boys in their youth who won fame and fortune through hard work and determination who will receive 1966 Horatio Alger Awards in New York next month in ceremonies at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel.

The name of the award is taken from the "rags to riches" success stories of the fictional Horatio Alger novels of yesteryear. Winners in previous years included former U.S. Presidents, Dwight D. Eisenhower and Herbert Hoover, the late Bernard M. Baruch, World War I Ace Eddie Rickenbacker, General David Sarnoff, Conrad Hilton and Dr. Ralph Bunche.

The 1966 winners besides Mayfield's W. F. Foster, are:

Roy L. Ash, Los Angeles, president and cofounder of Litton Industries, who began his career at 16 as a bank messenger.

Walter A. Brennan, of Hollywood, California, one of America's best-known actors who worked as a movie extra and struggled to become known in his profession.

Chester Carlson, Rochester, New York, inventor of the Xerox Corporation's xerographic process, who did odd jobs at the age of 12 to help his impoverished family.

William E. Grace, Detroit, president and chief executive officer of Fruehauf Corporation, who began his career as a part-time bookkeeper.

George W. Jenkins, Lakeland, Florida, president of the 125-store Publix Supermarkets, Inc., chain, who operated a general store while still attending high school.

Robert W. Hawkinson, Chicago, president of Belden Manufacturing Company, who worked in his teens as a gas station attendant and laborer.

John H. Johnson, Chicago, president of Johnson Publishing Company, and editor-publisher of four magazines—Ebony, Jet, Tan and Negro Digest—who borrowed $500 on his mother's furniture to begin publishing Negro Digest.

Samuel H. Levinson, Chicago, chairman and president of Railweight, Inc., Northfield, Ill., who worked his way through college selling clothing.

Elmer F. Pierson, Kansas City, Missouri, Chairman of the board and president of The Vendo Company, who began his career as a clerk in a grocery store.

Harold Toppel, New York and San Juan, P.R., chairman of the 178-unit H. C. Bohack supermarket chain and 14-store Pueblo Supermarkets, who helped support his family as a youngster by doing odd jobs.

Leslie B. Worthington, Pittsburgh, president and chief administrative officer of the United States Steel Corporation, who worked in a general store after school hours and began his career in the steel industry as a sales apprentice.

Thanks to a Marine in the Vietnamese Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN W. DYAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, as the Congressman of the 33d District of California, embracing a Marine Corps installation at Twentynine Palms, I am indebted to Paul A. Toneman, Sr., of Washington, D.C., for calling my attention to one of those marines, his wife, their feelings about the Vietnamese conflict, and what is being done for them. It is a source of great pride to me to represent such constituents.

In sequence, I cite first an innocuous inquiry from S. Sgt. William R. Grayson, USMC, 152287, serving with the 3d 8-inch howitzer battery:

JUDITH BARR WIG SALON,
712 H Street, NE.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MISS BARR: I saw your ad in the April issue of a magazine, and my thoughts turned to my wife waiting at home until I return from this nasty war here in Viet Nam. I think she deserves a nice gift and I'm sure that one of your wigs would do perfectly. I'm not very well versed in these things so I would appreciate your help. If you would please send the information I need to purchase one of your wigs; I've heard of your company before, through my mother who is a beautician. She tells me that you are the best, and that's good enough for me.

Louis and Michael Taff who operate the nationally known Judith Barr Salons, were quickly determined to go all out, at their expense, regardless of the cost of their cumulative plans. A short time later they heard from the sergeant again:

I received your letter today and I must say that I am truly amazed at your concern. It is deeply appreciated. America is truly a wonderful place and you have made me very proud to be member of our Great Society. Being the wonderful person she is, my wife will reject my surprise as being too extravagant on my part. She tries very hard and works very hard to save so that we can have

> a nice time when we are together once more. This is my second time in this area in less than one year, so when I was home last I didn't get to see very much of her. But as soon as we put an end to this threat to peace, there will be time to relax and enjoy the comforts of home.
>
> I certainly shall not tell my wife that I have sent her address, maybe it's not too late to have a surprise within a surprise—which she so truly deserves. You see, it's not so rough on me, being so far from home and my loved ones because this is my chosen profession. It's the women who suffer in so many ways, but still, it's for a cause that every American believes in, and if suffer we must, then suffer we will.
>
> Again, I thank you for your time and concern. To be able to do something for Louise from so far away makes me a very happy husband. We have not celebrated our anniversary or birthdays together for 3 years because of my overseas commitments. She was born the very day before me. It's been very nice talking to some wonderful people.

Front-page articles were carried in both the Washington Informer and the Capital Spotlight. From these articles I learned Mrs. Grayson works as a waitress in the enlisted men's mess at the Marine Corps Base in Twentynine Palms, Calif., while the sergeant is engaged in combat with the enemy. I also discovered the Judith Barr Wig Salons had not answered Sergeant Grayson at once but had talked to the Marine Corps Headquarters first and found no insurmountable obstacles. They had the cooperation of the editor from the local California paper, who had Mrs. Grayson telephone Washington.

For the combat sergeant, who was not aware of what he had started, all details were worked out in behalf of his wife. The Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington provided accommodations for Mrs. Grayson at no charge to anyone. The local Sheraton management wanted to have a part in supporting the morale of a serviceman fighting overseas.

Mrs. Grayson arrived in Washington on July 8 via American Airlines as a guest of the Judith Barr Wig Salons. She was fitted with a wig of her own selection. The cost of the wig, the transcontinental air transportation, and all other expenses were borne by the famed Judith Barr establishments, in happy collaboration with the Sheraton Park Hotel.

Being a Legionnaire myself, I am particularly pleased to highlight what followed. The American Legion really responded—the James J. Reese-Europe Post No. 5 placed all of its facilities, resources, and personnel at the disposal of Mrs. Grayson to make her visit truly memorable. An honor guard of eight was immediately appointed, to meet the lady's plane on Friday, July 8, Comdr. William E. Bibbs, an employee of the post office, greeted her in person along with several aids, and an escort for the drive to the Sheraton Park.

On Saturday morning, after being escorted to the Judith Barr Salon for the fitting and presentation, Mrs. Grayson was the honored guest at a grand luncheon arranged for her at the Two Caesars, with the DeEarl Barrie Beauty Salon as host. The District of Columbia commander of the American Legion, Richard Giasson, and his wife, Mrs. Dyal, and I were present with others. Immediately after lunch, with the assistance of the staff involved, the doors of the White House were opened to Mrs. Grayson and her entourage. The complete tour lasted about 90 minutes.

In the afternoon, Mrs. Grayson enjoyed the unique distinction and privilege of a private tea with His Excellency, Vu Van Thai, Ambassador of Vietnam, and his charming wife. Sergeant Grayson will be informed of this gracious act whereby this outstanding envoy indicates his country's feeling for the heroes we have sent to support liberty.

After a quick visit to the headquarters of the James J. Reese Legion Post, where many of the members had arranged to meet her, Mrs. Grayson enjoyed the delights of an informal dinner tendered in her honor on the Shoreham Terrace by the Honorable Stanley Barry, an executive of the Boy Scouts of America, who also has a marine son on active duty.

Mr. Toneman wrote Sergeant Grayson as follows:

> Your Congressman not only attended the luncheon, bringing Mrs. Dyal along to meet your wife, but he telephoned to this delighted constituent to offer his car and to do anything else she desired to make her stay in Washington something to be long remembered by the two of you.

In his latest letter Sergeant Grayson apologized for not responding promptly:

> Please forgive the delay in writing to you but we have been in an operation which ended yesterday. This is like something on TV, all the officers and men in my outfit think that it's wonderful, too. This is like seeing a dream come true; Louise has never flown before, and that's just one of the many things you are doing that will give us something to remember for the rest of our lives. With everything I am reading about this program for my wife it is almost like being there with her.

Sergeant Grayson, you placed the shoe on the wrong foot; it is we who salute and thank you for your valiant efforts in our behalf.

William A. Hyman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, William A. Hyman, able lawyer, expert on space law, and generally public-spirited citizen has passed away. He will be missed.

His partner, Melville Harris, will carry on his law practice and his longtime representation of Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., but the little personal things, the ability to rise in public indignation in a cause, these were personal to Bill Hyman.

The New York Times in its issue of Monday, July 11, gave his biography. While the cold statistics do not make the man, I set it forth as some evidence of his fine background:

> WILLIAM HYMAN, LAWYER, IS DEAD—EARLY ADVOCATE OF RULES FOR OUTER SPACE WAS 72
>
> William A. Hyman, a prominent lawyer who was one of the first advocates of laws to govern the use of outer space, died Saturday at the Neurological Institute, Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center. He was 72 years old and lived at 25 Central Park West.
>
> Mr. Hyman was a partner in the firm of William A. Hyman & Melville Harris, specializing in insurance, negligence, and medical malpractice cases.
>
> As chairman of the subcommittee on air space of the New York State Bar Association, he urged cooperation among diplomats, scientists and lawyers to alert the public to the problems by the exploration of space.
>
> Mr. Hyman once noted that the trouble with many of the arguments over ownership of space is that the earth turns. "What is the air above one man's land one moment," he observed, "is the air above another man's land seconds later."
>
> In 1961, before the first manned space flight, he presented what he termed "Magna Carta of Space" to the Inter-American Bar Association conference in Bogota, Colombia. This series of proposed laws on outer-space use fell on deaf ears.
>
> Last January, a limited edition of his book, "The Magna Carta of Space," was published. In it, Mr. Hyman maintained that the principles he first suggested in 1958 and codified in 1961 had been gradually winning acceptance throughout the world.
>
> He delivered a copy of his book to Pope Paul VI during a private audience in February.
>
> The Pope described the book as "an international pathway toward peace" and conferred upon Mr. Hyman a Papal Medal for his work for international peace.
>
> FIGHT FOR PATIENTS
>
> In 1964, Mr. Hyman led a legal crusade against the unauthorized use by physicians and scientists of elderly, indigent, chronically ill people for experimental purposes without their consent. The patients had been injected with live cancer cells.
>
> He carried the fight through the State Court of Appeals, New York's highest court, for patients to have the right to choose whether experimental drugs and procedures would be used on them.
>
> His work won him a Certificate of Honor from the National Health Federation as a "champion of human rights and defender of the dignity of man."
>
> William Abramowitz Hyman was born on July 29, 1893, in Baltimore. His family soon moved to Tampa, Fla., where he spent his boyhood.
>
> He was educated at St. Joseph's Parochial School in Tampa and then worked his way through Washington and Lee University and the Columbia University School of Law.
>
> In 1916 Mr. Hyman went to work in the claims department of the Aetna Casualty & Surety Co. In 1929 he started his own law practice.
>
> During the administration of Governor Alfred E. Smith, Mr. Hyman was a special deputy attorney general of New York State.
>
> He was president and chairman of the board of governors of the Brooklyn-Manhattan Trial Counsel Association, chairman of the Committee on Aeronautics of the Federal Association of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut, chairman of the committee on the law of space of the New York County Lawyers Association, and chairman of the section on interplanetary space law of the Inter-American Bar Association.
>
> He is survived by his widow, the former Marjorie Cohn.
>
> A funeral service will be held at 2 P.M. tomorrow at the Riverside Memorial Chapel, 76th Street and Amsterdam Avenue.

A New Twist in Driver Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an excellent editorial which appeared in the July 2, 1966, edition of the Madison Courier.

The editorial describes something of a new twist in driver education methods.

In Madison, high school pupils enrolled in such courses were sent out to observe grownups and follow teenagers in the process of day-to-day driving. The reports turned in by these fledgling motorists are eye openers.

The editorial follows:

ALL EYES ARE ON YOU

A group of Jefferson County youngsters had a field day, or rather, two of them, several days ago when they quietly watched the behavior of grownups who were unaware of being observed. The occasion was a traffic survey conducted by about 100 students enrolled in driver education courses at Madison High School.

The teen-agers were startled to see how many traffic violations were committed in the two days of the survey. They recorded 6,824 actual cases of jaywalking, and almost as many of failure to obey "Wait" signs at corners. Student surveyors also checked motorists not only in Madison, but also at several points out in the county, noting frequent violations of traffic ordinances, such as failure to stop at stop signs, to yield right-of-way, to slow at caution signs or warning blinkers, and to turn properly. Many of these offenses are actually violations of the law and drivers committing them are legally subject to arrest.

As every parent will tell you, the great moment most teen-agers live for is the time when they can drive. The American economy is an automobile economy and the automobile looms large in the lives of most Americans. The United States owns more motor cars than any other country; more in total production, in cars in use, in number of cars per thousand of population. About one American in four owns a car of some sort.

The local boys and girls who are enrolled in driver education courses this summer will spend 30 hours in a classroom, and 18 hours of supervised driving in cars, 6 of them behind the wheel, before they are entitled to credit for the course.

This is a fine thing. Every year the alarming increase in cars on the road makes driving more of a hazard and less of a pleasure than the year before. Cars are creating apparently insoluble traffic problems and in many cases cities are literally being clogged up and choked to death by cars.

The death toll on the highway is devastating, and grows higher by leaps and bounds. So it is almost imperative for everyone involved to be as knowledgeable, skillful and careful as possible, and the more trained drivers there are, the better.

But how long are these youngsters going to follow the rules they are learning now when they see the grownups, many of whom, ignoring the whole problem? One salient fact of human nature (which makes bringing up children so hard), is that the young are more likely to be influenced by example than by precept. They do as we do, not as we say. So when they see adult drivers carelessly and casually moving about, oblivious to rules of courtesy and safety, they are apt to forget their careful training and join the slap happy crowd.

City and state police officers are constantly on guard, trying to make life safe for drivers and pedestrians alike. But they simply cannot be everywhere or have their eyes on everyone all the time.

The rules were made to protect everyone, as far as possible, and to prevent painful injuries and deaths. Observing them takes only a few seconds of our time in most cases.

Surely we owe it to ourselves, as well as to others, to cooperate and do our best to avoid instead of cause accidents. And to remember that young people are watching. If they see adults showing by their actions that safety and courtesy are serious matters to them, they are apt to follow the same path.

To coin a cliche—the life you save may be your own! Or even more vital, your child's.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago important changes began to take place in Eastern Europe. In the aftermath of de-Stalinization policies the Eastern European countries become more independent from the Soviet Union and won greater freedom to determine their own affairs. The dogma of a uniform international communism was gradually replaced by the recognition that different peoples and nations ought to choose policies which better suited their individual national situation and needs.

The forces of polycentrism have been steadily growing. Only a few months ago we saw Rumania's dramatic initiative in asserting her national sovereignty and political independence. During the first decade of the cold war there was no question that the nations of Eastern Europe were wholly Soviet satellites; countries dominated by the Soviet Union, subject to continuous Russian intervention and often outright repression of their people by physical force. This situation has changed noticeably, however, and the political and human rights of the Eastern Europeans are no longer wholly denied. Persuasion and negotation now often take the place of coercion. We welcome this change wholeheartedly, as it can only serve the causes of freedom and peace. Moreover, polycentrism has not only had an impact on international relations in Eastern and Central Europe, it has at the same time contributed to greater internal liberalizing tendencies. The people of Eastern Europe are the beneficiaries of this change.

We hope, Mr. Speaker, that the conditions in Eastern Europe will continue to improve, for we have only witnessed the beginning of a change so far. The countries of Eastern Europe must gain greater independence, and their people must have greater freedom. America is committed to the ideas of freedom and independence and the fate of the captive nations could not and will not be indifferent to us.

All people have a right to determine freely their own affairs, whether they are Armenians or Byelorussians, Czechs or Slovaks, Ukrainians or residents of the Baltic States. Americans give their support to these brave people and their aspirations for freedom and independence, and we look with hope to the day when it will no longer be possible to speak of "captive nations" or "captive peoples."

Headmaster Frank Boyden of Deerfield—Part VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent procedures, I am pleased to insert at this point in the RECORD a further excerpt from the New Yorker magazine Profile article about Frank Boyden, headmaster at Deerfield Academy in the First Congressional District of Massachusetts.

In this segment of the article, we pick up further selections from the headmaster's voluminous and perpetual stream of correspondence. We learn also of his love and interest in horses, and how these and other interests combine to create a furious daily routine that perhaps helps to explain the almost fantastic vitality of this man now in his 86th year.

The excerpt follows:

THE HEADMASTER—VII

FEBRUARY 3, 1928.

DEAR CHARLES: Thank you very much for your cordial invitation to speak before your Men's Club. Unfortunately, I have only one talk, which is the story of the development of Deerfield Academy in general and of Tom Ashley in particular. If you wish me to give that and then answer any questions which may be asked by the men, I shall be glad to do so.

DECEMBER 10, 1934.

MY DEAR MRS. GRAVES: Thank you very much for your cordial invitation to speak for the ladies of the Baptist Church. I am one of the few headmasters who realize their speaking limitations and have not spoken anywhere for the last few years.

SEPTEMBER 5, 1953.

DEAR MRS. BANNISTER: I can come and would be glad to say just a word or two but, as Mrs. Dwight will tell you, I am entirely out of my element, I don't do it well and don't like to do it at all. Mrs. Dwight, as I am sure you know, always speaks well and can talk for an indefinite period.

SEPTEMBER 28, 1953.

DEAR MR. COWDREY: Your letter is a very appealing one and I share your sentiments with regard to Amherst, the Connecticut Valley, and Western Massachusetts. My own home was in the town of Foxboro, but I have been in Deerfield now for fifty-one years and I am thankful to have spent my life in this valley. . . . Many years ago I realized that I was not a good speaker and that that was a field in which I was not qualified and so for many years I have not spoken. I have no definite topic. I would not quite know how to approach any other than an educational subject, and in my work have just gone ahead from day to day without any particular theory or any particular policy except a real personal interest in the boys, in their work, and in their activities. I am afraid you would be very definitely disappointed in any effort which I might make.

September 8, 1949.

Dear Mr. Wilk: I really question the advisability of a moving picture about Deerfield and particularly about me. I hope you will understand, however, how much I appreciate your interest.

June 12, 1948.

Dear Mr. Garland: I have heard several rumors to the effect that I was to retire, but so far as I myself am concerned I have no idea of doing so. . . .

Every secretary he has had remembers this scene: While the headmaster is dictating, his hostler goes by outside the window in the act of exercising one of the headmaster's carriage horses. The headmaster gets up in the middle of a sentence, goes out the front door, and takes over the reins. He rides around in his buggy for ten minutes and comes back, sits up on the fire screen again, and picks up the sentence just where he broke it off. He owns sixteen buggies and four horses. "Nothing will ever take the place of the horse and buggy with me," he says. "I go back to that period. I don't drive much these days, but the mere fact that those horses are out there brings me a lot of comfort." For years after he came to Deerfield, he made his trips home to Foxboro in his buggy—two days, ninety miles, and an overnight in Worcester or Barre. As his children grew up, he often confused their birthdays with the birthdays of colts that had been born at about the same time. His knowledge of the behavior of horses helps him in his handling of boys, and the reverse is probably true as well. The only pilgrimages of any kind that he has ever made have been to Goshen. On the walls of his office in the school building there are, among other things, six pictures of horses, including one of Assault, and a letter from President Eisenhower thanking him for the use of a horse and buggy. Mounted as a hood ornament on the nose tip of Boyden's big black Cadillac is a chromium sulky-and-horse that was given to him by one of his Amherst friends. The car was waiting for the light at Forty-fifth Street and Seventh Avenue one day when a man stepped off the sidewalk, shoved his head through the window, and—assuming that the headmaster was a trotting king—asked him for a hot tip on that night's meeting at Roosevelt Raceway. The headmaster's wife hates horses.

August 23, 1946.

Dear Mr. Downing: Thank you for your letter, which I enjoyed very much. I wish that more people could experience the thrill of driving a good horse. Last Wednesday, I drove all three of mine. The first, Hollywood Robin, was once a very fast race horse. He has a natural road gait of from ten to twelve miles an hour. In spite of all his power and strength, he is very easily handled, and he gets as much fun out of a trip as I do. Talisman, the second, is a beautiful chestnut with one white ankle and one white leg. He is a more delicate horse but is very good on the road and in some ways more of a handful than Robin. Don, the third, is a fat, lazy, little Morgan who can go just as fast as you want but will not voluntarily contribute anything to the speed of the ride. On the other hand, he is a comedian and keeps the whole stable in an uproar when given the chance.

October 2, 1953.

Dear Mr. Brown: Yesterday morning early, Bert Tilton, who takes care of my horses, sent me word that Don was very sick. We had a veterinary immediately, but there was nothing that could be done, as he had had a very bad heart attack and passed away shortly. Up until then, he had been in perfect health, and just the night before ate his grain and hay and also kicked around because he was feeling so good. I do want you to know how much I have enjoyed him during the twenty-eight years since you sent him down. He has always been very much of a personality, and I have never had a horse that meant so much to me. He liked to travel, and when he couldn't go fast enough to suit himself at a trot would swing into the smoothest pace that I have ever seen any horse have. A ride with him was always a pleasure, because there were always so many exciting things along the road from squirrels to pheasants to attract his attention. There was never anything mean or difficult about him, and everyone, including the little children who came almost every day to see him, will miss him.

December 30, 1953.

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Maybury: Thanks ever so much for your very clever Christmas card. I did not realize that the horse and buggy would be inside the barn until I lifted it up. Those really were good old days, and I wish that more people were in the horse and buggy stage. I am really quite lonesome as I go out, because I guess I am the last one with a driving horse, but I get a real satisfaction as people stop along the street and everyone in the automobiles turns to look at Madagascar as we go along. He really is a wonderful little horse. He is a smart little apple and nothing escapes his attention. Somehow or other, when I get very tired, nothing relaxes or refreshes me so much as to ride behind a good horse.

July 23, 1945.

My Dear Mr. Hinricks: I am very much interested in the illustration at the heading of your stationery, for when I first came to Deerfield forty years ago there was an old horse trader with a very long white beard who looked like your illustration. He could drive anything and handle the most difficult horse with no effort whatsoever. I am enclosing a check for $3.00 to cover my subscription to *Hoof Beats*.

Books come and go in the headmaster's study, but some seem to have been there longer than others. Among these are "The Complete Book of Horses," "New Testament in Four Versions," "Herbert H. Lehman and His Era," the *Foundation Directory*, "Ways of Giving to Amherst," "The Reverend Jonathan Ashley House," "Jamestown 1607–1957," *Congressional Directory*, "From Maine Pastures to Vermont Shores," *Miller's Catalog* (*Everything for the Horseman*), "Operation Crossroads Africa," "Building a Championship Football Team," "Coaching the Zone and Man-to-Man Pressing Defenses," "Cavalcade of American Horses," "Horses at Home," "Selections from the Old and New Testaments," *Private Independent Schools*, "Steve Mather of the National Parks," "Phillips Exeter Academy—A History." However, the books that the headmaster likes most to read, the novels of Agatha Christie, are not in evidence; he keeps these upstairs. He says that a headmaster does not have time for wide reading, but he has what is known in some circles as the luck of the dip. He can dive into the middle of a book and emerge with a highly quotable fragment that might escape the memory of someone who had read the book thoroughly. A year later, the fragment may pop out in conversion. He is honest about such devices. "You know, I read a very interesting book," he will say, and then he will correct himself, saying, "I didn't actually read the book. I opened it." The magazines in his main living room, strewn about in rampant variety to divert the faculty, include *Defenders of Wild Life News*, *American Forests*, the *New England Farmer*, *Main Currents in Modern Thought*, *Protestant Church Buildings & Equipment*, *Natural History*, the *United States Investor*, the *National Parks Magazine*, and the *Massachusetts Review* ("New Light on Emily Dickinson").

March 31, 1947.

Dear Mr. Sullivan: I have been away most of the time for the past two weeks and have missed the Foxboro *Reporters* for February twenty-eighth, March eighth, March fifteenth, and March twenty-seventh. If you have any extra copies of those issues, I would appreciate your sending them to me.

October 13, 1934.

Dear Mr. Caton: I saw the other day the notice of your Birthday Anniversary and want to write you and Mrs. Caton a note of congratulations and best wishes. I always remember with pleasure the good times we had at your house and occasionally on Sunday nights my mind goes back to the stereopticon entertainments which you gave at the church.

January 25, 1935.

Dear Mr. Finnety: I was very much interested in the item in the Foxboro *Reporter* about your eighty-eighth birthday. I remember very well when we used to meet at church.

December 16, 1946.

Dear Mrs. Thompson: I have just been reading my copy of the last Foxboro *Reporter* and find that I missed your birthday. I hope that you will excuse me this time and I am putting it down on my calendar for next year.

At nine o'clock, he gives up dictating and goes over to the school building, which he enters through the Browsing Library, a high-ceilinged, oak panelled room with reference books on its shelves and newspapers on its long oak tables. This morning, a man, a woman, and a boy are standing in one corner, obviously feeling strange as they wait for an interview with a young admissions man. The headmaster walks over to them. "Hello," he says. "My name is Boyden." The people are from Minnesota. The headmaster launches into a long discussion of geographical distribution and its importance to an independent school. Have they, by chance, read the article in the school paper by the boy from Rhodesia? He'll see to it that they get a copy. On he moves into the main corridor, where he meets the admissions director of Rutgers University and the admissions director of Princeton. He tells them a story about a man he recently encountered in a club in New York. The man heard him mention Deerfield, Massachusetts, and said to him, "Do you live there?"

"Yes," said the headmaster.

"Do you know the old man who runs the school there?"

"Yes," said the headmaster.

"How old is he?"

"Eighty-six, I believe."

"Can he still get around?"

A long-distance call comes in from a woman whose son has decided that he wants to go to college immediately and does not want to go through the formality of completing his senior year at Deerfield. The headmaster takes the call at his desk. When he puts the phone down, he sees his athletic director in the corridor and complains to him that there has been a letdown in the way receptions after sports events are handled.

The headmaster of another school—a former master at Deerfield—telephones. "We had them seventeen to fourteen when one of our very good backs fumbled a punt," Boyden tells him. "Andover? They are a little better than Exeter. Playing Exeter was like playing one of our smaller high schools around here. They'll get back at us—don't worry."

He has a call put in for him to Calvin Plimpton, president of Amherst, to whom he complains about a stipulation placed upon Amherst and Deerfield in the transfer of securities from a Wall Street trust to both institutions. "After all," he says, "it was

Charlie's money." This is a reference to the late Charles E. Merrill, Amherst '08, a close friend of the headmaster, and a founder of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & (in his time) Beane.

"There is nothing like given money away," Merrill once said happily to the headmaster.

"Charlie," said the headmaster, "we see eye to eye."

He sits down at his desk to watch the boys go by between classes. He waves to them and calls two aside to ask them questions. When the building has become quiet again, he goes downstairs and into the duplicating room, where he fusses with some papers and makes unflattering remarks about the Xerox machine, not because it jams once in a while but because it is a machine. He goes into another room and tells the alumni secretary about a trip he made to New York the previous day. (An observer standing outside 30 Rockefeller Plaza might have seen him step out of the car in a cold wind, without his coat, slightly stooped, and with a frayed briefcase under his arm. He handed the doorman a dime and moved toward the revolving door of the great skyscraper, looking very worn and tired. Anyone's heart would have gone out to him for undertaking these long, exhausting journeys for his school, going alone to make rounds of the city that would last all day. But the pathos of it all was modified, because when he came back out through that revolving door he had a hundred thousand dollars in the briefcase.) He reports this sum to the alumni secretary. "I just look old and frail and sick," he once told a Deerfield parent in describing his approach to fund-raising. Throughout his career, he has assiduously cultivated the appearance of helplessness—a talent for which he has found many practical applications.

He talks to the master who runs the school bookstore about remodelling the store and doubling its size. The downstairs corridor is jammed with teachers drinking coffee. He talks to one after another—thirty seconds apiece. He retreats to a small room to discuss ideas for a new library with his faculty committee on architecture, which includes his son John. He goes back up to the main floor and stops to speak to a boy from India who is about to be interviewed by the man from Princeton. Another headmaster is on the phone—like the earlier caller, a former master at Deerfield. He has lost a physics teacher and needs one as soon as possible. Boyden says he will do what he can. He spends a few moments with the admissions man from Swarthmore. He signs a couple of dozen letters. His handwriting is firm and forthright, unflorid but remarkably graceful. Penmanship like his has not been widely taught or practiced in this century. For ten minutes, he confers with a fellow-trustee of the University of Massachusetts, who has stopped in on his way through town.

The headmaster is chairman of the university board. The University of Massachusetts was once the Massachusetts Agricultural College, a small institution in Amherst. It had a thousand students in the early nineteen-fifties, and, like all state schools in Massachusetts, it was under complete legislative control. The college could'nt make a move—could not even hire a new teacher or schedule a new course—without the approval of the state. Boyden eventually changed that. In 1962, he persuaded the legislature to give antonomy to the university. The university has increased its enrollment to over thirteen thousand, and in a few years it will level out at twenty thousand. New buildings—some by I. M. Pei, Marcel Breuer, Kevin Roche, and Edward Durell Stone—radiate from the original campus not so much by the dozen as by the mile. One new building, the largest gymnasium in the United States, is called the Frank L. Boyden Physical Education Building. Boyden has presided over all this development with a hand that is used to holding reins. He is known among his fellow-trustees, many of whom come from the eastern part of the state, as "the fastest gavel in the west."

The headmaster says goodbye to his fellow-trustee at the Browsing Library door, then, within eight minutes, talks with an alumnus who has brought his son to the school as a candidate for admission; a boy who has just been interviewed by Harvard; another alumnus and his wife; and a master who is eager to tell him—and is given sixty seconds to do so—that a visitor from Groton was impressed by Deedfield's new dormitories. Still another applicant for admission comes into the school building with his father. The headmaster urges the father to sit down and talk, while the boy is interviewed elsewhere. The headmaster's treatment of the man is too excited for this to be, say, the president of Bethlehem Steel, so he must have something to do with a major-league baseball club. The man actually owns one. The headmaster apologizes that he is no longer coaching at Deerfield and starts to talk about Leo Durocher and Warren Spahn. The conversation lasts for more than half an hour and never once touches upon the man's purpose in coming to Deerfield, but his son's chances of getting in are one-in-one. After they leave, the headmaster reviews the afternoon schedule, talks for several minutes with a math teacher, goes into a study hall and touches the arm of a sleeping boy, returns to his desk, signs more letters, and tells another story to the admissions man from Princeton. It is almost noon. He goes over to his house for a short nap.

He is not taking the nap because he is eighty-six and needs it in order to keep going. He has been doing this all his life. Even more than fireplace fires, his naps are the essence of his mechanism, for he can go to sleep absolutely anywhere, at any time, and he can sleep soundly, if he chooses, for less than three minutes. Sometimes, while he is interviewing parents, he will press a button and his secretary will appear and say that he has a phone call. Excusing himself, he goes out, holding up five fingers to indicate the number of minutes he wants to sleep. He pulls a shawl over himself. It takes him thirty seconds to fade out. After five minutes, he is awakened. Up goes the hand again, this time with three fingers extended. Three minutes later, the secretary awakens him again. He gets up—as fresh as if he had slept through a night—and goes back to the interview. The first component of this art is that he can wash his mind free of anything at any time. Then he starts at the north end of the village and tries to remember who lives in the first house. George Lunt. Then he moves to the next house. He has never got beyond the third house. He can go to sleep while he is waiting for an operator to put through a call. Most of the time on automobile trips, he either dictates or sleeps. On athletic trips with his teams, when he was the coach, he used to sleep all the way, and the only things that could wake him up were "kid stuff," as he would put it, or off-color stories. "Cut that out," he would say, and go back to sleep.

Congressman Horton Commends Constituents' Help for Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to certain of my constituents who are presently in Vietnam and to indicate the pride I feel for what they have been able to accomplish in support of our men and mission there.

Among the items to which I wish to call my colleagues' attention are a series of articles written by Mr. Ross Boyle, former president of the Rochester Junior Chamber of Commerce who resigned in February to go to South Vietnam as a consultant to the Agency for International Development. These articles published by the Rochester, N.Y., Times-Union demonstrate clearly the service which Mr. Boyle has accomplished in informing the people of Rochester of the present situation in Vietnam as well as the contribution that his activities have made in bettering the economic and social conditions of the South Vietnamese people.

In support of Mr. Boyle's work, the Jaycees of Rochester have recorded a series of comments from people in our community and sent this tape to him. Mr. Boyle is playing this tape in various places as another example of the feelings his fellow Americans have for South Vietnam. I was pleased to record my comments for this purpose and would like to share them with my colleagues, as well:

To Ross Boyle, past President of the Rochester Jaycees and now currently serving with the Agency for International Development in Viet Nam, I wish to thank you for informing Rochesterians of conditions in Viet Nam by your articles which have appeared in our local newspapers. I hope you will play this tape in many places in Viet Nam so that Rochesterians and other servicemen will know of your country's gratitude for the important mission you are performing. As a member of the United States Congress, I can assure you that we in Washington are very much aware that full freedom for South Viet Nam means economic self-sufficiency as well as military security. In both of these areas, I am pledged to doing all in my power to insure the provision of whatever assistance is required for success. I join your fellow Americans in saluting you for helping to carry around the world our philosophy of freedom. Clearly our goal in Viet Nam is freedom—freedom for the individual, freedom in government, and freedom of a nation's future.

Mr. Speaker, with permission, I would like to have inserted here in the RECORD one of Mr. Boyle's early columns. I think it demonstrates very clearly the insight of Mr. Boyle into the situation in Vietnam and our effort there. Also I think it demonstrates that the people of Rochester are being given an excellent perspective with which to view conditions in South Vietnam.

The column follows:

VIETNAMESE SELF-HELP "WELL PLANNED"

(By M. Ross Boyle)

U.S. EMBASSY, SAIGON.—It is, of course, impossible to be here in Viet Nam more than two or three days without developing opinions. Anyone who is here a week automatically is classified as an expert on Viet Nam and its problems. However, since I have now been here a month, I am beginning to realize how unexpert my ideas on how to win the war and the peace are. But there is one aspect of our U.S. involvement here which I would like to emphasize.

The war in Viet Nam is in the headlines every day—number of military actions, number dead, wounded, captured, number of missions flown. Now, following the Honolulu Conference, even the struggle for improving the lot of the Vietnamese people is getting some coverage because Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Gardner have both come to review the situation with large parties of experts and have made many recommendations on returning to the U.S.

The day-to-day job that is being done and has been done for the last 10 years and more by the men and women of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) here in Viet Nam is generally ignored. These Americans, now numbering more than 800, along with several hundred assistants from other areas of the Far East and over 1,000 Vietnamese, work quietly but effectively with the government of Viet Nam to provide the people with improved education, better living facilities, adequate food, and a better understanding of a democratic way of life.

Contrary to popular opinion in the U.S., this task is not accomplished by merely giving away American dollars and commodities. Dedicated men work long hours, seven days a week, planning a well balanced program designed to help the people help themselves.

Some of the most successful programs run here are self-help projects in which the U.S. provides a hamlet with a few bags of cement and some aluminum roofing material and the people build themselves a school. They then identify themselves with that school and if the Viet Cong attempt to destroy it, they lose the support of even the portion of the hamlet population that had been VC sympathizers.

To implement projects of this kind we have province representatives who live and work in every one of the 43 provinces of South Viet Nam. They act as advisors to the Vietnamese province chief, construction engineers, truck drivers, friend, midwife, and whatever else is needed to show the people the good side of the American.

I have just returned from a two day trip during which I visited province representatives in Nha Trang, Cam Ranh City, Ban Me Thuot, and Bao Hoc. They were proud of the accomplishments which the people in their areas had made—schools, refugee centers, orphanages, new market places, agricultural experimental stations, and many others. They were also concerned about how much more needed to be done. They are dedicated and enthusiastic.

If we are able to achieve any real lasting success here in Viet Nam, it will be men like those in AID who will be responsible because they live with the problem every day.

Two of the people I have met here in the mission are ex-Rochesterians—Bob Klein is mission program officer, responsible for planning the projects to be implemented throughout the country. He lived in Brighton and worked at Kodak Park for six years from 1958 to 1964. Ray Gordon is head of the Food For Peace operation here. Several years ago he was employed by the Gannett Newspapers.

This is an operation which probably will play as big a part as the military operations under Gen. Westmoreland in any long range success which will be achieved here but the American people hear too much about the war effort and military buildup and not enough about the people-to-people civilian effort being undertaken.

It will do us no good to win battles unless we can follow them up with well planned and well implemented programs of social reform. That is what only 800 American civilians (not 225,000 troops) are undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to pay tribute to another of my constituents, Peter R. Liebschutz, who also is acting as a consultant to the Agency for International Development. I had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Liebschutz on the steps of the Capitol just before his departure for Vietnam earlier this year and talked with him about his forthcoming work. Recognition also should be given to Mr. Kenneth Halaby, of Rochester, who had joined Mr. Boyle and Mr. Liebschutz in Saigon with AID. Realizing the sacrifices that these men have made to take leave of their regular jobs for a period of 6 to 8 months, it is a privilege to commend them publicly in the hopes that such actions and their mission will not be forgotten in the context of combat.

On March 12 I said in addressing the Rochester chapter of the American Institute of Banking:

> Economic assistance alone cannot continue as an effective diplomatic device. We need to encourage popular participation of the people in these foreign lands so that they are partners in the progress of their country.

It is in this area that the Agency for International Development performs a vital function and it is to men like Boyle, Liebschutz, and Halaby that credit can be given for the structure of such programs as they exist today in Vietnam. We must never overlook the fact that private individuals like these men are working daily in order to guarantee that a free South Vietnam will be able to survive and grow in the years following the cessation of hostilities in that land.

I also am pleased to take note of the efforts of the 31 students in the Twelve Corners School in Brighton, N.Y., who have sent gifts to be used in an orphanage in Saigon. The students are members of Mrs. Susan Davis' fourth grade class.

The schoolchildren have mailed boxes of clothing, soap, toothbrushes, toothpaste, bandages, towels, washcloths, and toys to Army Capt. Hilton Bicknell in Vietnam. Captain Bicknell in turn distributed the items to the children of one of Saigon's orphanages.

The idea originated with 9-year-old Lauren Crawford, who was acquainted with Captain Bicknell's family. Lauren interested her fourth grade classmates in the idea, and through their combined efforts immeasurable good was accomplished in Vietnam.

I salute these children and their elders who through their own abilities and initiative have done so much to help the Vietnamese people. I urge my colleagues and all who might take note of this speech to explore similar avenues of assistance to Vietnam. I firmly believe that the road to peace and prosperity in Vietnam will be paved with the contributions made by Americans and Vietnamese working together today.

As We View It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and following a prior insertion in the Congressional Record dated April 27, 1966, page 8728, entitled "A Housewife Looks at the Great Society," I would like to insert in the Record an editorial from Radio WMRN Script, Marion, Ohio, entitled "As We View It." The editorial, dated May 29, 1966, follows:

AS WE VIEW IT

It might make a sounder United States if the story told in this letter to Congressman Durward Hall, and read into the Congressional Record by him, April 27.

Probably the most important phase of the situation, however, is the reaction from the White House, to which the Congressman referred the letter as he had been requested. Hall says "A short time later, Mrs. Stafford received a reply from the White House. As might be expected, the White House missed the entire point of the letter and suggested several ways in which the Stafford family might get on the Federal gravy train."

After telling about watching their disposable income shrink as increased social security and other taxes ate up more and more, Mrs. Stafford writes—"I am getting just a little tired of seeing men and women sitting around collecting welfare and producing children. Living in rural areas where they could have gardens, a cow and chickens, yet not lifting a hand to do so—example:

"One—One-quarter mile from us is one family. A family of nine children (last count). The father probably is 70 years old, the mother may be 35, the children from one to 17. Big healthy children! No garden, no cow, no chickens, Welfare!

"Two—One-quarter mile in another direction, a widow lady almost 70 years old, 5 feet tall, 200 pounds, has a heart condition, lives alone, has a garden each year, makes jam and jelly by the gallon, as well as canning all her garden vegetables. She has lived her whole married life on the 120 acres she now lives on alone, Without welfare!"

Mrs. Stafford has an interesting postscript to her letter, and commenting about "no one has to work to get things—if he can get on welfare." She writes—"I am told that since the youth program began, it is practically impossible to get anyone to put bailed hay in the barn. Who wants to lift those heavy bales when you can get $1.25 an hour for "goofing off" for someone who doesn't care whether you do a good job or not, since the Government is paying your salary anyway?"

This is what we have commented on for years—it isn't the billions of dollars the federal government has wasted in its rat hole programs—it is what continued handouts have meant to disintegration of character of the American people. We have become a nation of suckers—those who pay and those who receive.

How can we ever expect to reverse the trend started by Franklin D. Roosevelt's socialistic welfare state—capitalized on by the politicians who saw an opportunity to spend and spend to elect and elect. Roosevelt showed it could be done—with his four elections as president.

Nobody in government will ever have the courage to face hard economic facts—not even if the people adopted a Constitutional amendment limiting the term of president to six years, non successive. Congressmen still must be reelected every two years—and you can see what they have been doing with appropriations in the past months.

The first responsibility of every politician seems to be to himself—to get elected or reelected. Everything else is secondary, truth, honesty, intelligence, the welfare of the United States. Don't expect that to change either, not on this earth.

The People Look at Employment, Social Security, and Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the morning's mail brought to my desk three letters pointing to vital problem areas in employment, social security, and pensions.

The first is a letter from a woman in California describing conditions of discrimination against women in the armed services. The second letter, written by Jim Barry, of California, makes a sensible suggestion on social security. The third letter, written by a Flint, Mich., man, Robert B. Linn, Jr., relates to pension systems. Mr. Linn makes a criticism against present pension plans better than any accountant or any other person who appeared before my Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy at the time of our investigation of pension plans. He also makes some interesting suggestions for improvement. The letters follow:

The Honorable MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GRIFFITHS: I was happy to see that finally someone is being made aware of the sex discrimination in the services.

As the woman marine told you, a husband is not entitled to quarters, and if the wife has orders to go overseas, the husband does not "rate" transportation.

A husband is not entitled to medical care. I have seen wives who were not even citizens receive thousands of dollars of care, while my husband can't get an aspirin. And although I have no objection to people-to-people projects (for example the "elective surgery performed on Vietnamese by U.S. medical personnel) it does get under my skin that my husband would be thrown out of a military hospital if he requested the same.

The PX restriction is a farce—I can purchase items for my husband just as many men buy cosmetics, etc. for girl friends. If I buy him clothing and have to return it because of incorrect fit, its just a bother to me and the PX.

I am due for orders shortly, and I wonder how I might go about putting in a claim for my husbands travel as well as mine. Although some may say it doesn't matter, things like this can, sad to say, jeopardize a career. It seems that if it does, the career isn't worth much.

I have served in the Armed Forces for almost ten years and wish to continue. However, I'd like to be treated as an officer, and as such receive the pay and allowances of an officer, not a female.

Would you advise me to go ahead and file a travel claim when the time comes? It seems somebody has to start the ball rolling. Just in the last ten months I have "lost" $250 in quarters allowances that married male officers have—whether they are married to "heiresses" or "really dependent" women.

I certainly hope something can be done soon. It should be, and retroactively, at that I don't appreciate having my husband regarded as an unwanted stepson.

Hon. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GRIFFITHS: This is to acknowledge and express my appreciation for your letter dated June 15, 1966 which was in reply to mine concerning "Pensions".

I have some more thoughts on this problem which may or may not be of interest to you. Under Social Security pensioners are allowed to earn up to $1500 per year. Deductions are made from the Social Security payments during the month in which a person earns from $1.00 to $125.00. This arrangement is unfair and should be amended.

The maximum should be $1800 per year in the least and should be charged against the pensioner on an annual basis for this reason.

A person may live in an area where he is able to secure only seasonable work to supplement the pension, i.e. may earn $300 per month for only 3 months out of the year which is a total of $900.00 he is at a disadvantage over the person working a few hours per day throughout the year but who may earn a total $1500.

Also due to wage adjustments the past 2 years the usual wage rate for employment which pensioners are able to find pays $300 per month for 8 hours per day and 5 days per week. Employers who are willing to split the work load between 2 pensioners 4 hours each per day would gross them each $150 per month, this would result in a reduction of Social Security payments. Eighteen hundred dollars per year maximum would not alter S.S. payments.

Social Security use the gross earning figure whereas they should consider one's NET income after taxes and other deductions would amount to only about $240 per month. If S.S. used Net figures then the $1500 maximum would be okay ($120 half time).

Most available to pensioners is positions with Stock Brokers as Runners. Mail room work, guard work and the like. Regardless of what level they attained during productive years the older people are just not employed for positions higher than those described and one is fortunate even to secure this type of work.

Persons on welfare and on the poverty program fare much better than pensioners who throughout life time have made some contribution to the country.

Cordially,
JIM BARRY.

Representative MARTHA GRIFFITHS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MA'AM: I read of your private pension investigation in the Detroit Free Press of May 27, 1966; that is why I am writing this letter.

I went to work when I was thirteen years old and living in Arkansas. Since then, I have worked at many jobs such as digging ditches, working in grainerys, driving tractors and trucks, worked as a welder, Millwright and Electrician both on maintenance and construction. I have also worked at repairing cars and trucks in garages.

The reason I have had so many jobs is I was willing to work at anything to pay my own way for my family and me. I have six children now and so far the Good Lord has let me take care of them real good. Yet today, I have no pension time built up because everytime I had to change jobs, I lost my former pension rights. I have paid dues into the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Washington, D.C. Union Pension Plan for eighteen years, yet if I miss paying one months' dues, I lose what little pension rights I might get in the future (I don't have any pension rights through this plan yet). I have also paid into the General Motors Plan for six years and still have nothing under it if I lose or quit my job today.

I figure if I could receive credit for all the years I have worked I would have twenty-six years of pension rights.

I have gone to school in my spare time and night to learn Real Estate. Now that I have a chance at bettering my social and financial standing, I am reluctant to take the chance because if I quit, I will lose what pension time I have built up. I cannot freeze the six years I have paid into the G.M. Plan or the eighteen years I have paid into the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers pension plan.

The following I would like to recommend for your consideration:

No. 1. I would like to see all pension plans put under Social Security. This would give you company to company rights.

No. 2. Have all private pension funds transferred to the Social Security fund. This would insure workers of collecting their pensions when they retire.

No. 3. Federal Law requiring all empyoyers to contribute a percentage for each hours' work in an amount that would give a worker sixty-five percent of his earnings when he retires, with a minimum equal to the Poverty Program Cost of Living Recommendations.

No. 4. Any pension above the minimum would be based upon wages received for each year worked. Therefore, if a man's wages advanced in later years, a company would not have to pay extra into the fund.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT B. LINN, Jr.

Floor Statement by Chairman Holifield Concerning Uranium Enrichment Services Criteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Commission on July 1, 1966, submitted to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy proposed "Uranium Enrichment Services Criteria," in accordance with the 1964 private ownership amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The act requires that these toll enriching criteria lie before the Joint Committee for 45 days while Congress is in session before becoming effective.

The AEC's proposed toll enriching criteria, and the contracts which the Commission intends to use in providing these services, are of great significance to the Government and the rapidly expanding nuclear power industry. Accordingly, the Joint Committee intends to hold one or more public hearings on these criteria and related matters prior to the expiration of the statutory waiting period, which commenced on July 11.

The committee hearings, at which testimony is expected from Government and industry witnesses, will also afford a timely opportunity to review other subjects pertinent to the private ownership legislation. For example, we will probably wish to consider the AEC's policies for lease and sale of uranium, and for safeguarding against diversion of fissionable material in the hands of licensees. The Joint Committee expects to announce the dates of the planned hearings within the next few weeks.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD at this point the proposed "Uranium Enrichment Services Criteria," and the AEC's letter dated July 1, 1966, transmitting these criteria to the committee:

U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1966.
Hon. Chet Holifield,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

Dear Chairman Holifield: Pursuant to section 161v of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission hereby submits to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy proposed Criteria for uranium enrichment services.

Draft proposed Criteria were published in the Federal Register on October 1, 1965 and a 90-day period was set for receipt of public comments. In addition, draft contracts reflecting the method of implementing the Criteria were made available on request. Comments were received from eleven organizations and discussions were held with a number of industry representatives convened by the Atomic Industrial Forum. After consideration of all comments received, appropriate modifications have been made and the modified Criteria are submitted herewith.

In addition to the matters specifically set forth in the Criteria, AEC will agree generally to waive the 90-day period between feed and product delivery, as provided in item 5(a), for the 120-day period immediately following January 1, 1969. We intend to announce this waiver at, or prior to, the JCAE hearings on the Criteria.

We are separately providing to the JCAE staff, for the information of the Committee, copies of the draft contract forms which are planned for implementation of the Criteria. Copies of these draft contracts are also being made available for public comment and/or use in connection with the hearings on this matter.

Cordially,

Glenn T. Seaborg,
Chairman.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION URANIUM ENRICHMENT SERVICES CRITERIA

1. GENERAL

(a) The United States Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) hereby gives notice of the establishment of criteria setting forth the terms and conditions under which it offers, subject to available capability, to provide uranium enrichment services in facilities owned by AEC, as authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act). Specifically, these criteria are established pursuant to section 161v of the Act, which was added by Public Law 88–489, the "Private Ownership of Special Nuclear Materials Act." As used in this notice, the term "enrichment services" or "enriching services" means the separative work,[1] necessary to enrich or further enrich uranium in the isotope 235. The enrichment services shall be provided pursuant to contracts to be entered into (1) with persons licensed under section 53, 63, 103 or 104 of the Act, and/or (2) in accordance with agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to section 123 of the Act.

(b) The contracts will provide for the furnishing of depleted, normal or enriched uranium by the customer and the delivery by the AEC of an appropriate quantity of enriched or more highly enriched uranium. The quantity of material to be furnished by the customer in relationship to the quantity of enriched uranium to be delivered by the AEC and the related amount of separative work to be performed by the AEC normally will be determined in accordance with the then-current standard table of enriching services published by the AEC.[2] In the event, however, that the AEC does not have available capability to undertake to perform requested enriching services on short notice in accordance with such standard table, the AEC may agree to perform such services in accordance with such other table as is within its capability. The general features of standard contracts, including the basis for AEC's charges for enriching services, are set forth herein.

(c) Except as specifically provided, nothing in this notice shall be deemed to affect the sale or leasing of special nuclear material by the AEC or the entering into of "barter" arrangements whereby special nuclear material is distributed pursuant to section 54 of the Act and source material is accepted in part payment therefor. Neither the execution of an agreement for the furnishing of uranium enrichment services nor the termination or expiration of such agreement will in itself alter or affect any rights and obligations of any AEC licensee under its license or construction permit other than those regarding any allocation of special nuclear material in connection therewith.[3]

(d) The criteria contained in this notice are subject to change by the AEC from time to time; however, any such changes shall be submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for its review in acocrdance with the Act.

2. EFFCTIVE DATE

This notice shall become effective as of 1966.

3. PERIOD OF CONTRACT

Contracts with domestic licensees will be for specified periods of time up to 30 years. Contracts entered into in accordance with an international agreement for cooperation must be for a term within the period of such agreement. In either case, contracts may be entered into at any time after the effective date of this notice; however, no such contract shall provide for delivery of special nuclear material by AEC or delivery of uranium feed material to AEC before January 1, 1969.

4. ENRICHMENT OF URANIUM OF FOREIGN ORIGIN

There is no restriction on the provision of enrichment services to persons furnishing as feed material uranium of foreign origin where the enriched product is not intended to be used in a utilization facility (as defined in the Act) within or under the jurisdiction of the United States. Where the enriched material is intended to be used in a domestic utilization facility, however, the standard contracts will prohibit the furnishing of feed material of foreign origin. This prohibition is established, pursuant to section 161v of the Act, in order to assure the maintenance of a viable domestic uranium industry. From time to time, the AEC will review the condition of the domestic mining and milling industry to determine the need for continuing this restriction, modification or removal of which shall constitute a change in these criteria.

5. GENERAL FEATURES OF STANDARD DOMESTIC CONTRACTS

The following types of contracts have been developed in the light of the uncertainties necessarily attendant to contracts which may be for periods as great as 30 years. Accordingly such contracts will provide that, at the request of the customer, the AEC will negotiate and, to the extent mutually agreed, amend them, without additional consideration, in a manner consistent with the criteria then established by the Commission in accordance with the requirements of section 161v of the Act to eliminate or reduce restrictive provisions which the AEC determines are inequitable, discriminatory or no longer required to protect the Government's interest.

The AEC will use two standard types of uranium enrichment contracts to be entered into with domestic licensees. These are entitled (a) Agreement for Furnishing Uranium Enrichment Services (Domestic Customers—Firm Quantities), and (b) Agreement for Furnishing Uranium Enrichment Services (Domestic Customer's Requirements). The AEC may also offer a uranium enrichment contract combining features of the foregoing types of contract.

The type of contract first mentioned, at the customer's option, will either (i) define the specific quantities and assays of enriched uranium to be delivered to the customer, the schedule for such deliveries, and the quantity and assay (or a range of quantities and assays within permitted amounts) or feed material other than natural uranium to be delivered by the customer, with the remainder of the required feed material to be delivered as natural uranium, or (ii) define the amount of enriching services to be performed by the AEC in terms of units of separative work as related to the AEC's standard table of enriching services in effect at the time the parties agree to such amounts and provide for the adjustment of such amounts in the event of a revision of the AEC's standard table of enriching services through the application of such revised standard table to the relevant portion of a reference schedule of feed material deliveries by the customer and enriched uranium deliveries by the AEC incorporated into the contract for this purpose. The second type would provide for the furnishing of part or all of the customer's requirements for enriching services for a designated facility or facilities during the term of the contract.

In addition to the items discussed above, the more significant provisions of the standard domestic contracts are summarized below:

(*a*) *Delivery schedules*

Deliveries of specific quantities and U–235 assays of feed material to AEC and enriched uranium to the customer shall be in accordance with the agreement between the parties and (except as provided in 1(b) above) in accordance with the published AEC standard table of enriching services in effect at the time of the delivery of enriched uranium by the AEC. The schedule for delivering enriched uranium to the customer shall reflect an interval after receipt of feed material equivalent to the estimated average time which would be required to receive, handle, and process equivalent feed material to the desired enriched uranium. The AEC will not necessarily use the specific feed material furnished by the customer in producing the enriched uranium delivered to the customer. Unless otherwise agreed, deliveries of feed material to AEC shall precede requested deliveries of the enriched uranium by at least ninety (90) days. The AEC may agree to perform enriching services in cases where the lead time requirements for furnishing feed material are not satisfied; in such cases, an appropriate surcharge may also be imposed to provide for recovery of additional AEC costs and interest charges.

(*b*) *Chemical form and specifications of material*

Both feed material furnished to the AEC and enriched uranium delivered to the customer are required to be in the form of UF_6 and conform to the AEC's established specifications as published in the Federal Register and in effect on the date of delivery.

(*c*) *Charge for enriching services*

(1) The charge for enriching services, in accordance with the Act, will be established on a nondiscriminatory basis and provide reasonable compensation to the Government. Applicable charges for enriching services and related services will be those in effect at the time of delivery of enriched uranium to the customer as (i) published in the Federal Register, or (ii) in the absence of such publication, determined in accordance with the Commission's Pricing Policy. The charge per unit of separative work for enriching services will be the same as that employed in the Commission's published schedule of charges for sale or lease of enriched uranium. The AEC may impose an appropriate surcharge representing additional costs if any to the

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

AEC for providing enriching services on short notice.

(2) The Act requires that such charges provide reasonable compensation to the Government. AEC's charge for enriching services will be established on a basis that will assure the recovery of appropriate Government costs projected over a reasonable period of time. The cost of separative work includes electric power and all other costs, direct and indirect, of operating the gaseous diffusion plants; appropriate depreciation of said plants; and a factor to cover applicable costs of process development, AEC administration and other Government support functions, and imputed interest on investment in plant and working capital. During the early period of growth of nuclear power, there will be only a small civilian demand on the large AEC diffusion plants. These plants were originally constructed for national security purposes, but will be utilized in meeting future civilian requirements. In this interim period of low plant utilization, the Commission has determined that the costs to be charged to the separative work produced for civilian customers will exclude those portions of the costs attributable to depreciation and interest on plant investment which are properly allocable to plant in standby and to excess capacity.

(3) Projections of supply and demand over a reasonable time period will be used in establishing a plan for diffusion plant operations. This plan will be the basis for establishing an average charge for separative work over the period involved, which charge will be kept as stable as possible as operating plans are periodically updated. Under such operating plans, AEC will at times be preproducing enriched uranium. Interest on the separative work costs of any such preproduced inventories will be factored into the average separative work charges.

(d) *Ceiling on charge for enrichment services*

The contract shall specify for the term of the agreement a guaranteed ceiling charge, subject to upward escalation for the cost of electric power and labor. The ceiling charge as of July 1, 1965, the base date for application of escalation, is $30 per Kg unit of separative work for separation of U–235 from U–238. (In its standard table of enriching services, as well as its schedule of charges for sale or lease of enriched uranium, AEC will take into account any significant effect of the presence of other isotopes of uranium on the number of separative work units required to perform a given U–235—U–238 separation.)

(e) *Customer's option to acquire tails material*

The customer shall be granted an option to acquire tails material (depleted uranium) resulting from the performance of enriching services. The option as to quantity (Kg U) of tails material desired by the customer, within the maximum quantity subject to the option, must be exercised at the time of delivery of the related quantity of feed material. The U–235 assay of the tails material delivered to the customer will be within the sole discretion of the AEC. The maximum quantity of depleted uranium subject to the option will be equal to the difference between the total uranium supplied by the customer as feed material and the total enriched uranium furnished to the customer, less processing losses as established from time to time by the AEC. No charge will be made for tails material delivered to the customer under the agreement other than AEC's withdrawal, handling and packaging charges. Delivery of tails material will normally be at the same time as delivery of enriched uranium.

(f) *Responsibility for material meeting specifications*

The customer warrants that all feed material meets specifications and, with stated exceptions, agrees to hold the AEC and its representatives harmless from all damages, liabilities, or costs arising out of a breach of the warranty where such damages, liabilities, or costs are incurred prior to inspection, assaying and acceptance of the feed material by AEC. However, the customer is not deprived of any rights under indemnification agreements entered into pursuant to section 170 of the Act (Price-Anderson indemnification). The AEC's obligation to furnish specification material to the customer terminates upon final acceptance of such material by the customer.

(g) *Termination by AEC*

(1) The contract may be terminated by AEC without cost to AEC upon reasonable notice at such time as commercial enriching services are provided by another domestic source; provided, however, that AEC will upon request by the customer rescind any notice of termination and will continue to furnish the services specified in the contract if the services of the domestic source are not available to the customer: (i) to the extent provided for in the AEC contract during the remainder of its term; (ii) on terms and conditions which are considered by the AEC to be reasonable and nondiscriminatory as between domestic and foreign customers; and (iii) at charges considered by AEC to be reasonable, nondiscriminatory, an no higher than the ceiling charge under the AEC contract, as escalated for the cost of electric power and labor.

(2) The AEC may terminate the contract without cost to the AEC in the event the customer loses its right to possess enriched uranium, defaults on its contractual obligations, or becomes involved in bankruptcy proceedings. In such instances the customer will be required to pay a termination charge determined as if the customer had terminated the contract on the notice, if any, given the customer by the AEC.

(h) *Termination by customer*

The customer may terminate the contract in whole or in part. In such instances the customer will be required to pay a termination charge equal to a specified fraction of the charges for those enriching services which would have been furnished but for such termination. Such fraction of such charge shall be a maximum of 0.25 of such charge for those amounts for which minimum advance notice of termination is given and shall be a lesser figure for amounts terminated for which a longer notice period is given. No termination charges shall apply to amounts of separative work which would have been funished at times three years or more subsequent to the date of receipt of the notice of termination of such amounts.

The amounts of separative work and enriching services charges related thereto (prior to the application of the specified fraction) shall be determined in accordance with the published AEC standard table of enriching services and established charges in effect on the date of the receipt of the notice of termination. The AEC will determine the extent to which, if any, such termination charges exceed the probable costs to the Commission which may arise from such termination and such charges shall be correspondingly reduced. Such determinations shall be final. Upon request of the customer prior to its delivery of a notice of termination, the AEC will advise the customer of the approximate amount of termination charges which would be payable.

(i) *Delivery—title*

The f.o.b. delivery point for both feed material furnished to AEC and enriched uranium delivered to the customer is the designated AEC facility. The AEC's enriching facilities are situated at Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Paducah, Kentucky; and Portsmouth, Ohio. Title to all material passes upon delivery.

(j) *Changes in charges and specifications*

Any change made after July 1, 1968, in the specification for UF_6, the AEC's standard table of enriching services, or any increase in the charge per unit of separative work for enriching services shall require at least 180 days' notice to the customer by publication in the Federal Register or otherwise.

(k) *Customer's requirements contracts*

In addition, requirements contracts will provide:

(1) Quantities and Enrichments of Material

The customer will be committed to obtain, and the Commission to provide, part or all of the customer's actual requirements for enriching services for a designated facility or facilities during the term of the agreement. Timely notice of the customer's requirements must be furnished to AEC. Except as provided in 1(b) above the quantities and enrichments of feed material furnished by the customer will be those required, in accordance with the published AEC standard table of enriching services, to obtain the material of higher enrichment desired by the customer. A maximum net amount of enriching services to be provided will be established.

(2) Utilization of Material

The contract will provide the basis for determining the portion of the customer's requirements for enriching services to be furnished by the AEC by describing the extent to which:

a. enriched uranium furnished by the AEC under the contract will, after being used in or in support of the operation of the designated facilities, be recycled or delivered to the AEC as feed material under the contract;

b. plutonium or U–233 produced in and discharged from the designated facilities will be recycled for use in or in support of the operation of the designated facilities;

c. special nuclear material obtained from sources other than through the contract or the operation of the designated facilities, will be used in or in support of the operation of the designated facilities, including delivery of such material to the AEC as feed material under the contract.

Where the contract does not initially provide for the recycle for use, as in b. above, of the plutonium or U–233 produced, the customer, at any time prior to June 30, 1973, or such later date as the AEC may establish for this purpose, may elect, without incurring termination charges, to so use such plutonium or U–233 thereafter. In such cases, the contract will also provide for use of plutonium or U–233, as the case may be, from another source in lieu of such produced material. The customer may further change such utilization of material by agreement or by terminating the contract in whole or in part.

6. GENERAL FEATURES OF CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO IN ACCORDANCE WITH AN AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION

It is expected that the general features of uranium enrichment services contracts entered into pursuant to agreements for cooperation with foreign nations or groups of nations will be generally consistent with those discussed above.

7. CORRESPONDENCE

Any correspondence involving this notice or request for copies of standard contract forms should be addressed to: Manager, Oak Ridge Operations Office, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Post Office Box E, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831.

Footnote continued on following page.

[1] The work devoted to separating a quantity of uranium (feed material) into two fractions, one a *Product* fraction containing a higher concentration of U–235 than the Feed and the other a *Tails* fraction containing a lower concentration of U–235.

[2] The initial table, as presently contemplated, will not provide to the customer flexibility to select a quantity of feed and an amount of separative work other than those specified in the AEC table. However, the AEC is giving further study to the question of providing, at some date in the future, a form of contract under which flexibility would be available.

[3] In view of the authority granted to the AEC under the Act to execute long-term fuel supply agreements, the AEC is reviewing its existing regulations and procedures with respect to the need for allocations of special nuclear material in licenses.

The 60th Anniversary of the American Hungarian Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, this is the 60th anniversary of the American Hungarian Federation, a civil organization of American citizens of Hungarian descent, uniting in itself most of the Hungarian-language churches, clubs, and associations in the United States.

The organization is headed by Judge Albert A. Fiok, of Pittsburgh, as national president and bishop emeritus, the Very Reverend Dr. Zoltan Beky, formerly of Trenton, N.J., now president of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, a fraternal insurance company in Washington. The federation concerns itself with immigration matters and with an observation and analysis of events and trends in Hungary.

On July 7, 1966, the President delegated Acting Assistant Secretary of State Walter J. Stoessel to receive a delegation from the American Hungarian Federation in his name and to accept a memorandum of the federation on American foreign policy.

The members of the delegation besides Bishop Beky and Judge Fiok were the secretary of foreign affairs, Prof. Z. Michael Szaz, of Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J.; Dr. Louis Fury, national executive secretary; and Rev. Joseph Kecskemethy, a member of the board of directors.

I think that my colleagues will be interested in reading the contents of this memorandum and in the thoughts of the federation on the current problems in Eastern Europe. The memorandum follows:

JULY 7, 1966.

The Honorable LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: Our organization, representing 600,000 United States citizens of Hungarian descent who are members of American Hungarian churches, clubs and associations, respectfully submits the following memorandum for your kind consideration.

We repeat again our wholehearted support of United States policy of helping the Vietnamese people to maintain and defend its freedom and national independence in the face of Communist subversion and invasion. We agree with the steps taken to ensure that Communist aggression be halted, including the recent raids against the oil storage facilities of Communist North Viet Nam near Hanoi and Haiphong. Our best wishes accompany you at a time when you and the United States have become the only beacon of hope for people willing to defend their freedom and national independence against Communist oppression and aggression.

As our members are of Hungarian descent, we pay close attention to events and trends in Hungary. We deplore the continuing denial of human and civil rights in Hungary and the permanent occupation of Hungary by Soviet Russian troops, despite 26 United Nations resolutions between 1956 and 1962.

We know that Hungary cannot be restored to genuine national independence as long as foreign troops are stationed at its territory. You have eloquently expressed concern for human rights and national self-determination in your address of May 28, 1966 at the third anniversary of the Organization of African States. We trust that you will do everything in your power to bring to an end the present semi-colonial status of Hungary.

In this connection, may we note that the Warsaw Pact does not sanction the presence of Russian troops in Hungary and that the agreement of May 27, 1957 between the U.S.S.R. and Hungary was concluded by the Kadar Government at a time when it was officially condemned by United Nations resolutions, failed to conduct any elections, and was generally ostracized by the world community outside of the Communist bloc. Therefore, even under international law, the agreement, signed under duress, remains of doubtful validity.

Today, we observe a certain loosening of the blocs in Europe. Even the Rumanian Communist Party Secretary in May, 1966 questioned the timeliness and basis of the maintenance of Soviet troops on the territory of Warsaw Pact states, including Hungary. We trust that in your policies you are working toward the goal of gaining Soviet consent for a withdrawal of troops from Hungary, thereby fulfilling one of the major demands of the United Nations resolutions.

As citizens of a free and democratic country, we are abhorred by the continuing denial of human and civil rights to Hungarian citizens by the present Government despite minor concessions in the last years. Arbitrary arrests and convictions, lack of representative governmental institutions, grave restrictions on the rights of worship, speech and assembly, imposition of a one-Party regime upon a people which has little or no sympathy for its goals are still salient characteristics of Hungarian life. The only solution lies in free, secret, and multi-Party elections.

While the election laws and civil rights are within the domestic jurisdiction of every state, we hold the United States has a legitimate concern when the most elementary political and human rights for its citizens are denied by the ruling regime. We hope that in our policy of "building bridges" to the peoples of East Central Europe we are not forgetting that any real contribution to world peace by these peoples is only possible if their national independence and the individual human and civil rights of their citizens are restored and respected.

One of the issues that concerns us deeply is the continued declining birth rate of the Hungarian people. This is due to a large extent to legalized abortions and not to birth control methods. The number of legalized abortions according to the present Government are in the neighborhood of 200,000 cases per year since 1957. This is a tragic indictment of the Communist regime in Hungary both because of people's despair in the future and the unavailability of housing for young couples with children. Economic improvement and more political freedom both must be worked for if the tragic situation should be alleviated, but in the meantime the abolition of the legalized abortion law must be demanded as a demand for international morality.

One-third of all Hungarians live outside of the confines of Hungary; the largest single group, approximately 1.7 million in Transylvania, now a Rumanian province. Their fate is similar to those in Hungary as far as political rights are concerned, but they are also discriminated against culturally, educationally and in regard to the economic development of their provinces. Over 100 documented cases are available to us about Hungarian professionals and civil servants being forcibly transferred into other provinces with no Hungarian population in order to deprive the Hungarian minority from its natural leadership, and most informants put such cases into the thousands. It is our hope that you will take into consideration the memorandum of the 48 members of the House of Representatives discussing this problem in the light of American foreign policy which was sent by Representatives SEYMOUR HALPERN and EDWARD J. PATTEN to Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

We realize that in order to defend freedom and the independence of small nations against communism, priorities have to be made, and Viet Nam today must have first priority. However, United States policy is showing signs of activity in Europe as well. May we respectfully ask that when decisions are made our suggestions contained in this memorandum be taken into consideration and that the United States pay increasing attention to the fate and future of the Hungarian people who, in 1956, have shown to the world the duplicity and mendacity of Communist theory and practice and struck a blow for human liberty finally dispelling the monolithic nature of communism and telling the non-committed peoples of the world the truth about Communist tyranny.

Again accept our most loyal and complete support in all of your policies designed to defend and extend freedom in the world, and especially our open endorsement of your course of action in Viet Nam, and expressing our appreciation, we remain,

Respectfully yours,
Rt. Rev. BISHOP ZOLTAN BEKY,
Chairman of the Board.
ALBERT A. FIOK,
National President.

In the Nation: The Last Heir of Monticello

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock which appeared in the New York Times of Thursday, July 7, 1966:

IN THE NATION: THE LAST HEIR OF MONTICELLO

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 6.—When Harry Flood Byrd sank today into the coma whence consciousness of the living world has departed, the political principles on which his every public position was firmly founded had already become ancient history in his party and in the popular concept of the role of government in the United States. Hence his death will not mark the ending of an age but instead the passing of the American statesman who most honorably and courageously exemplified its philosophy.

JEFFERSONIAN PRINCIPLES

He was the public man of commanding influence over contemporary political action who held steadfast to the fundamental Jeffersonian doctrines of democratic government. And he never compromised their essentials under the pressure of expediency, although, like all politicians, Byrd often experienced this force and knew the hazards of resistance. His long domination of the political process in Virginia can be partly accounted for by the particular appeal he had for Virginians as a fellow citizen whose status was fully established as the lineal heir to the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson. But it was Byrd's personality, character, courage and grasp of the subject matter and mechanics of legislation that account for his extraordinary and abiding influence in a Senate where Jefferson's doctrines were becoming more and more outmoded among members of both parties.

He was born to the struggle for attainment that was imposed on post-bellum youth in the conquered Confederacy, not excluding those who, as in his case, had a dozen or more generations of the great Virginia landholders in his family background. From the age of fifteen, when without parental knowledge or consent, he dropped out of high school to restore to solvency—as it proved—the Winchester newspaper over which his brilliant father exercised indifferent and sporadic proprietorship, hard work was Byrd's choice and his only heritage.

POLITICAL APTITUDE

As deputy head of the family, he financed for two brothers the college education he had denied himself. By the time Harry Byrd was of voting age, he had impressed himself on a growing area of the Virginia community as a coming man in the press and in politics. There duly followed a state legislative career of distinction, a tenure as Governor unmatched before and since for administrative ability, a stable economy and a party organization then and since totally free of corruption.

The trend of political science education in this country, and the wide collegiate and popular acceptance of the Welfare State as the expression of the only authentic American liberalism, have obscured the fact that there were earlier and proved claims to the designation. So that, as a subscriber to Woodrow Wilson's economic and social reforms, and to the 1932 Democratic platform which Franklin D. Roosevelt pledged to carry out if elected, Harry Flood Byrd was also a certified liberal. As such, he played one of the decisive roles in Roosevelt's first nomination.

Not until the second New Deal completed the blueprint of Roosevelt's shift toward the Federal centralization and collective statism that began with the end of The Hundred Days in 1933 did Byrd the liberal find himself tagged as Byrd the conservative. He had not changed except in constructive adjustment to the larger Federal responsibilities generated by the Depression, the prewar emergency and then the Second World War itself. But the thinking of Byrd's party had changed to the point of adopting the Hamiltonian Federalist concept overthrown by Jefferson, the party's founder.

SENSE OF HUMAN DIGNITY

A genial, courtly man, of natural compassion, with an acute sense of the common human entitlement of dignity, Harry Byrd did not oppose the various judicial and legislative compulsions of interracial association on the prompting of personal or group prejudice. He opposed them as invasions without constitutional warrant of the right of free choice of association in essentially intimate environments. He did not oppose Government deficit spending in all circumstances—such as war, war emergency, internal disaster—but as a fixed policy in a flush as well as in a depressed economy, and one which had never demonstrated the efficacy to attain its stated goals.

His death will not mark the date on the human calendar when, as the Swiss philosopher Amiel mourned a hundred years ago, "The age of great men is going." But certainly the end of Byrd's public career came when, as Amiel wrote in the same entry in his Journal, "The epoch of the ant-hill, of life in multiplicity, is beginning."

The War Against God in Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, during my service as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, our subcommittee has devoted considerable effort to finding out what is happening in Eastern Europe—and in reporting those facts to the Congress.

In one of the most comprehensive studies of this subject undertaken by the Congress, our subcommittee, nearly 3 years ago, held lengthy hearings on the social, economic, legal, and political developments in Eastern Europe. Many experts appeared before our subcommittee and their testimony filled two printed volumes which were so much in demand that they are virtually out of print by now.

Our able colleague from Connecticut, Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, did an excellent job in outlining and guiding those hearings, and deserves much credit for the results which they produced.

Again last year, our subcommittee held hearings on the conditions in the Baltic States, on the persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union, and on antireligious activities in all of the Communist-dominated countries of eastern and central Europe.

Because of our continuing interest in the plight of the people living under communism, I should like to call to the attention of the Congress a recently published book by Dr. J. Savasis, entitled "The War Against God in Lithuania."

I just finished reading a review of that book prepared by Father Daniel L. Flaherty, S.J., the executive editor of America magazine. The review itself is an excellent summary of the book—and a very clear and forceful exposé of the continuing war against God and religion being waged by the Communist regimes of Eastern Europe.

The bitter irony of that war comes from the fact that the constitutions of all of those Communist states guarantee their people freedom of conscience and belief—while in practice, no stone is left unturned, no effort spared by the regimes, to deny those freedoms to the people.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to place in the RECORD, and commend to the attention of my colleagues, Father Flaherty's review of "The War Against God in Lithuania" which was prepared for publication in the Lithuanus magazine.

The review follows:

THE WAR AGAINST GOD IN LITHUANIA

(By Dr. J. Savasis)

Anyone interested in a quick, cram course on how the Soviets go about suppressing religion need look no further than this small and inexpensive paperback by Dr. Savasis. It can be read and digested in a few hours at one sitting. The prose is spare and lean, with hardly a wasted word. Only occasionally does the author allow an ironic twist in a sentence to betray his objective reporting and reveal his personal feelings.

For a study of Soviet persecution of the Catholic Church, Lithuania makes an ideal paradigm. Before the Soviet takeover, 85.5 per cent of its more than three million inhabitants were Catholic; 94.4 per cent of its native Lithuanian population (80.6 per cent of the total population) were Catholics. Nearly every method known to have been used in other Iron Curtain countries was employed by the Soviet government of Lithuania, since the Communist pattern is generally the same everywhere. Dr. Savasis, therefore, has been able to analyze these patterns and narrate them in detail.

His book contains a host of documented facts and figures, but presented in a way that does not overwhelm the reader. The forbidding technical appearance of some other studies and reports of the situation I have read are happily absent here. (And if the statistics given here do not correspond in every detail to figures in other studies, it is doubtless because present-day statistics on the Church in Lithuania are extremely hard to come by—even for the Vatican). Dr. Savasis has also had the good sense to illustrate each pattern of Soviet persecution with concrete examples that make the actual application of each Communist tactic crystal clear, even for readers not yet familiar with Soviet methods or Communist double-talk on the subject of religion.

In the straightforward manner I find so appealing in this book, Dr. Savasis begins with an historical survey. His first five chapters cover only 30 pages, but they are brilliantly written. After a brief examination of pre-war Lithuania to set the scene, he vividly sketches the first Soviet take-over of the country. As a result of the infamous Ribbentrop Pact, Red Army troops invaded Lithuania on June 15th, 1940, after only a ten-hour ultimatum. Within one month, the occupying forces had announced the "separation of Church and state," expelled the apostolic nuncio, forbade teaching religion and recitation of prayers in schools, dismissed all chaplains, nationalized all private schools, arrested 2,000 Lithuanian leaders and elected a new Soviet Parliament from a single list of Communist candidates.

Within a year, 34,260 Lithuanians—the first of a planned 700,000—were shipped to Siberia. Bishops and priests were among those deported; seminaries were closed, all church property confiscated; the clergy left without any means of support. Moscow's emissary, Pozdniakov, told Church authorities that what had been accomplished in Russia in twenty years was to take only two or three years in Lithuania.

The Nazi occupation of 1941–44 meant little change for the Church. Schools and seminaries remained closed, Church property remained confiscated. More priests were deported, this time to Germany, and thousands more Lithuanians were deported—this time to labor camps in the Third Reich.

When the Red Army drove the Germans out of Lithuania in 1945, therefore, the Communists could take up against the Church almost where they had left off. Organized partisan resistance, begun under the Nazis, became the pretext for new and more vehement mass deportations. And because the bishops refused to denounce the resistance movements, the Church and the hierarchy were especially hard hit. By the end of 1947, Lithuania was left with but a single bishop. In that same year, the last remaining convents and monasteries were closed and religious communities dispersed; any person discovered to be a member of a monastic institution faced imprisonment or deportation.

There was a slight breathing spell or "thaw" following Stalin's death in March, 1953; it included an amnesty for some prisoners in Siberia. 35,000, or less than 10 per cent of the deportees, returned to Lithuania. The others, after their release from the prison camps, were forced to remain in Russia. About 130 priests returned to Lithuania, though some remained voluntarily in Russia to minister to the exiles there. Two bishops returned, but were not allowed to administer their dioceses. They had to live where they were told and they died in Lithuania without ever regaining their pastoral functions. In 1955, Rome appointed two new Lithuanian bishops. One has never been permitted by the Communist regime to assume his duties; the other operates under severe government restrictions—forbidden even to issue a pastoral letter.

By far the largest part of Dr. Savasis' book, though, deals with the present status of the Church in Lithuania under Soviet persecution. It is in these pages that he analyzes and explains in great detail the tactics of the Communist war against religion. It is in these pages, too, that he presents an outstanding handbook of Soviet strategy for anyone who cares to study the full range of Communist methods vis-a-vis the Church.

Since Lithuania is considered part of Soviet territory, the status of religion is covered by Article 124 of the Soviet Constitution, that peculiarly worded article which guarantees "freedom of religious worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda." Dr. Savasis begins, then, with an analysis of the massive Soviet campaign of atheistic propaganda—in the factories and on the farms, in the schools and in all social organizations, in the press and the mass media, in the arts and cultural activities. Even doctors are pressured into testifying that such religious practices as the kissing of crucifixes or relics, or the dipping of fingers into holy water, are unhygienic and dangerous to public health. Courses in atheism are required in all schools, and "Universities of Atheism" have been set up for the sole purpose of training lecturers and teachers of atheism.

The youth of the country are the special target of this indoctrination. It begins in kindergarten (specific examples are given in the book) and continues through the university. Dr. Savasis even includes a sample of the official lesson plans followed in grades 5 through 11. Unless a student masters his course in atheism at each level, he cannot progress to the next level of education. In the higher grades, students are given antireligious propaganda duties; if they refuse, they lose their scholarships or are expelled from school. Even during summer vacation, they are required to lecture and conduct atheistic discussions in summer camps for younger children. If they fail to do so, they cannot return to school.

In order to "protect" children from the religious influence of parents and grandparents, a law forbids all persons under 18 to attend church. Parents who refuse to co-operate can lose their jobs or suffer other penalties. The same is true of parents who insist on having children instructed by the parish priest, which is strictly forbidden. Children are also forbidden to participate in religious services as altar boys, choristers, etc.; they may not even march in a church procession. Parents and priests who permit children to violate these regulations can be severely punished.

Priests who do teach religion to young people are accused of violating "Soviet cult regulations" (since Communist culture is officially atheistic) or of violating "freedom of conscience" (since they contradict what the children are taught in school). The press constantly accuses priests of such violations, but no newspaper will print a denial by a priest of such slanders nor will any court try a libel case brought by a priest. The reason is that such slanders in the press are seen as a legitimate extension of the "freedom of antireligious propaganda" clause of Article 124.

It is impossible to list in this review all the ways by which the Soviet government of Lithuania persecutes religion. Dr. Savasis, however, has outlined, analyzed and illustrated every facet of Soviet strategy. From this standpoint, I cannot recommend the book too highly. About the only tactic used in other Iron Curtain countries that is not mentioned in this book is the now-familiar attempt to form a "national" Catholic church subject to the State. The aim of this maneuver is to split the Church away from Rome, thereby weakening it and ultimately destroying it in practice. I should note in closing, however, that such an attempt was made in Lithuania. It failed and was quietly shelved, however, when no authoritative clergyman could be found to serve as a figurehead for such a government controlled church.

DANIEL L. FLAHERTY, S.J.

The War on Hunger Will Bring Benefits to U.S. Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article in the March 1, 1966, issue of Forbes has just come to my attention. I feel that the discussion it presents on the beneficial aspects of the war on hunger for U.S. business is of sufficient importance to warrant its inclusion in the RECORD. I hope that the Members of Congress will note especially the spirit of cooperation that exists between the private and public sectors for work on this urgent humanitarian problem.

The article follows:

WORLD HUNGER: ENEMY OF U.S. PROSPERITY

Two-thirds of the people of the world are now face to face with famine. Humanitarian reasons aside, the U.S. cannot let them starve because a starving nation is not a market.

One billion people, a third of the world's population, drag themselves through the day weak from hunger, an easy target for disease and frequently for death from starvation. Another billion are badly malnourished, almost on the borderline of starvation. What we call progress, civilization, prosperity is meaningless to two-thirds of the human race. These people are only half alive. They are half dead from hunger.

The average American consumes 3,100 calories a day in foods rich with proteins, vitamins and minerals. In the underdeveloped nations, the average person must drag his body along on a mere 2,030 calories a day, and his food usually is deficient in those nutrients. While the U.S., Western Europe, Japan and a few other nations get richer, the hungry get hungrier, because, in the underdeveloped part of the world, human fecundity is outstripping agricultural fecundity. In Asia and Latin America in the past five years the population has risen by 12% and 17%, respectively. In contrast, production of food has risen by only 10%. The result is that per-capita food production has fallen by 3% in Asia, by 7% in Latin America.

The deadly effects of the population explosion aren't for tomorrow. They are here and now. Today.

As Chairman Robert S. Stevenson of Allis-Chalmers puts it: "The U.S., Canada and Australia are going to have to feed the world, or we're going to have to help the world feed itself." Nobody realizes this more keenly than President Lyndon B. Johnson and his top aides. The more newsworthy problems of Vietnam and inflation have not, even for a day, crowded it out of their deliberations.

Humanitarian motives aside, the President and his aides know full well that the U.S. economy cannot continue to grow without an expanding world market. Moreover, as the President has noted, quoting Seneca, "A hungry people listens not to reason, nor cares for justice, nor is bent by any prayers."

The malnourished masses love their children as intensely as well-fed Americans love theirs. They are not about to starve peacefully and quietly, in patience, resignation and fatalism, as their ancestors might have done. They know there is a world without hunger somewhere outside their dusty villages. They have transistor radios, and they have bumped in rickety buses into market towns. They have taken seriously the politicians' promises of a better life. They will riot and kill to achieve it. They are doing so right now.

ESCALATION

Almost in desperation, the U.S. plans to escalate its efforts to deal with the world hunger problem. In so doing it will create tremendous opportunities for businesses that have the knowhow, the foresight and the capital to help end hunger.

President Johnson fired an opening gun in the stepped-up war against hunger when he sent a message to Congress last month, asking for a new food program to replace the present Food-for-Peace program. Public Law 480, which expires this year. The President did not spell out all the details of his Food-for-Freedom program, but, even so, agricultural experts agree that it eventually will have an enormous impact on the entire U.S. economy. For one thing, it will change the whole direction of the foreign aid program. Until now, foreign aid has gone primarily toward industrial development; hereafter, it will be directed more toward agricultural development. The Food-for-Freedom program will have an even greater impact on U.S. agriculture. Since the first Agricultural Administration Act, the U.S. Government has attempted to keep food production down. Now, the Administration plans to offer inducements to farmers to raise production of certain foodstuffs. Under the Food-for-Peace program, the U.S. sent abroad primarily those agricultural products it had in surplus in government warehouses. Now, it will gear its production more directly to the needs of the hungry, using incentives to increase production of certain foodstuffs when necessary.

Out of this inevitably will come several other developments: Little by little, land which has been retired from production under the present farm program will be brought back into cultivation. The exodus of marginal farmers into the cities will be speeded up, since they will not have the capital to expand production as the Government requires. The big farmers will get bigger. Even if world prices of agricultural products don't rise, the big farmers will become so efficient and have such an enormous market they will be able to prosper with lower subsidies—or even without them.

One expert, Don Lerch, a Washington management consultant who specializes in agriculture, believes that by 1976 there will be only 500,000 farmers in the U.S. (as compared with 3.2 million today). But, he quickly adds, they will all be immensely prosperous.

The farmers of Canada and Australia also will benefit. Both countries, as a result, are likely to keep booming.

The U.S. plans to fight the war against hunger on two fronts. The first will be a crash program to supply the underdeveloped countries with food. The U.S. has been giving away $1.5 billion worth of food abroad every year under Public Law 480. If Congress approves the President's new program—as seems all but certain—food shipments could rise to $3.3 billion by 1967–68. This move is designed to cope with such emergencies as the recent drought in India, which already has led to Communist-organized riots in the state of Kerala.

In the long run, the second front will be the decisive one. This is the self-help part. Every nation receiving U.S. aid will have to promise to build up its own agriculture as swiftly as possible. Not only *promise*, but show results. The reason for this is simple. "We don't have enough capacity to feed all these people," says Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman. "Unless they learn to feed themselves, there will be world famine. The estimated increased needs between now and 1980 are in the neighborhood of 300 million tons. The potential reserve productive capacity of this country is 50 million to 55 million tons more. There is a 250-million-ton gap here that only the underdeveloped nations themselves can fill."

Along with the food, therefore, the U.S. will send the underdeveloped nations fertilizer and farm equipment. It will also encourage U.S. companies to build fertilizer plants and farm-equipment factories abroad. It will teach farmers in Asia and Africa and Latin America how to make the most of the land they have. It will urge—and even arm-twist—governments to re-rig archaic policies in the field of price incentives, farm credit and land reform. This will all be done under the Agency for International Development (AID).

Increasing food shipments abroad will mean increasing production at home, for according to Freeman, the reserves in government storage don't come anywhere near the world's requirements. "Our reserves are now in the land rather than in the storage bin," he says. Grain in storage has been dropping steadily since 1961—wheat, from 1.4 billion bushels to 800 million; feed grains, from 77 million metric tons to 50 million.

This means that millions of acres of land that have been retired under the present farm program eventually will be brought back into production as needed. It will be done gradually, Freeman says, first to prevent chaos in the marketplace, and second because there isn't enough shipping to handle all the food the U.S. farmer could produce if the wraps on him were taken off all at once.

All told, there are now nearly 57 million acres of U.S. farmland "in reserve." Freeman won't reveal just how many he intends to put back into production, but some government officials believe it will be somewhere between 5 million and 7 million acres. He already has taken a small step in that direction. "Just last month," he points out, "I discontinued the alternative of voluntary acreage reduction whereby a spring wheat producer could take 10% out of production and get paid for doing it. The producer no longer has that option. He has to plant his full allotment."

MORE TO COME

The acreage allotment for rice will be increased this year by 10%. Many experts believe it will eventually be necessary to increase the allotment for winter wheat. Says Claude W. Gifford, senior economist of *Farm Journal*: "A shortage in wheat is only a few years away."

Freeman's guideline will be the President's promise to Congress to "bring these acres back into production as needed—but not to produce unwanted surplus." In short, to change the very nature of U.S. agricultural policy but without causing chaos on the farm and in the marketplace.

In his message, Johnson called for increased production of soybeans. The Secretary of Agriculture believes this can be achieved by the judicious use of incentives—more acreage with guaranteed prices. "In corn," he says, "we have too much. We still have a surplus. We'll do something which will make it possible for those farmers to plant soybeans on those acres and come out just as good. We need the soybeans. We don't need corn." Soybeans produce a high-protein, low-cost diet meal for animals. They also are one of the richest sources of protein in food mixes for humans.

Robert W. Engle, manager of marketing of Allis-Chalmers' farm equipment division, believes that increased production will have to come from improved farm equipment and improved farm techniques, as well as from greater acreage. "One area where output per man hour has been neglected is farm materials handling," he says. "There are going to be some giant strides made in coordinating a farmer's growing system with a pushbutton, automated method of handling and storing his crop.

"Another way of increasing farm production is . . . by growing two stalks of corn where only one grew before. . . . Instead of growing corn in the standard 38- or 40-inch news we've tried it in 30 or 20. Yield often increases 10% or 15%."

CHANGE IN POLICY

Under Public Law 480, the U.S. has either been giving the food away or else selling it for local currency. In simple fact, selling it for local currencly almost invariably has meant giving it away, because so little of the currency can be used. According to Sam I. Nakagama, a senior economist of the First National City Bank of New York, the U.S. now holds an amount equivalent to two-thirds of the currency of India as a result of selling the Indians food. Most of this money obviously can't be used; spending it would create horrendous inflation. Under a tacit agreement with the Indian government, therefore, the U.S. simply hoards it. The U.S. now holds $2.8 billion in counterpart funds.

Under the Food-for-Freedom program, food will no longer be sold for local currency and only a maximum $800 million worth will be given away. Only those nations which clearly can't subsist except on charity will receive free food. The U.S. will grant the others—nations like Taiwan, Spain, Greece and the United Arab Republic—long-term credits at low interest, perhaps 2%, to buy the remaining $2.5 billion worth. They will have to pay the world market price. They will be required to repay the money in dollars.

Prices also should be bolstered by the fact that, at times, the U.S. will have to get the food on the open market.

There are those who fear that, by helping other nations increase their food production, the U.S. will destroy its own commercial food-export market, which now amounts to about $4.5 billion a year. According to Freeman, these fears are groundless. Experience proves, he says, that, as a country raises its production of food, what it does is switch to importing other U.S. agricultural products like animal feeds. The result is a net gain for the U.S. farmer. Freeman cites the case of Japan. That country used to get massive agricultural aid from the U.S. It soon may be buying $1 billion worth of U.S. farm products annually on a straight cash basis. Western Europe, which also used to receive agricultural aid, is now this nation's biggest customer of feed grains and poultry. In 1964, U.S. food exports to Western Europe totaled $2.3 billion.

As Freeman sees it, prosperity abroad, therefore, will mean prosperity at home. "Every 10% increase in per capita income [abroad] results in a 16% increase in the commercial imports of our products," he says.

In the fight to increase production of foodstuffs abroad, the U.S. will count particularly on the manufacturers of fertilizer. Says David E. Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development: "Fertilizer will be our biggest need." Dr. Lester R. Brown, staff economist of the Department of Agriculture, adds: "Ironically, the less-developed regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which contain two-thirds of the world's people and where the food needs are greatest, use only 5 million tons of the 35-million-ton annual world total. In other words, only one-seventh of the world fertilizer supply is used in the regions containing two-thirds of the population. As the supply of new land that can be brought under cultivation diminishes, fertilizer becomes the principal substitute for land in the food production process."

FERTILIZER BOOM AHEAD

The U.S. is now shipping about $325 million worth of fertilizers abroad every year through foreign aid and commercial channels. By 1970, it will be shipping about $1 billion abroad each year. In addition, the U.S. will spend about $250 million to help build fertilizer plants in partnership with natives in the underdeveloped countries such as Gulf Oil's project in Korea.

Says an AID chemical engineer: "One million dollars worth of food aid will feed 70,000 people for a year, but the same $1 million put into fertilizer would help feed 200,000 people for a year."

AID's Bell is also counting on farm-equipment manufacturers and food processors to help beef up the agriculture of the underdeveloped countries. The farm-machinery makers will have to develop equipment especially designed for their needs, he says, pointing out that in India, for example, "the land holdings are very small. Farming takes on the characteristics of gardening. You need small power units, hand equipment almost."

A great deal rides on the success of this new program—which partly explains why support for it seems to cut across party lines. President Johnson's proposals have the support of many Republicans, who in the past were leery about foreign aid. Much of the Republican leadership in Congress comes from farm states, where food-aid programs naturally have strong support. Moreover, as Senator Milton R. Young of North Dakota, the ranking Republican member of the Senate Agricultural Appropriations Committee, points out, "Republicans originated the whole Food-for-Peace program back in the Eisenhower Administration." He adds: "I think the President will get substantially what he wants. Giving people food and helping them produce more food is the best kind of foreign-aid program."

Is the Food-for-Freedom Program alone big enough to deal with the problem? No. The sad fact is that, no matter how generous it is, it can only supplement the efforts of the underdeveloped countries themselves.

Some pessimists think that the problem is hopeless; that the population explosion is now out of hand. But some very hard-headed experts think otherwise. To quote Bryson M. Filbert, vice president and director of Esso Chemical Co., a big factor in the world fertilizer business, "It is possible to double or even triple agricultural production in all of Asia, Africa and Latin America through the use of more fertilizers, more irrigation, better seed varieties, more pesticides and other improved farm practices. I have been told by experts that four times the present world population could be supported by widespread use of improved farming methods."

But the key word is "could." To turn "could" into "will" is going to take some very drastic, very fast changes in the underdeveloped countries themselves. Almost without exception they misread the economic history of the prosperous nations. They only noticed that these countries built industries and turned farmers into workers. What they failed to note was that in most cases such countries did so only after developing a prosperous agriculture first. In part this misreading of history was due to an obsession with the "Soviet experiment."

RUSSIA'S BAD EXAMPLE

The Soviets reversed the normal process of economic development. By starving agriculture of capital and by keeping food prices artificially low, they made the farmers bear the cost of building hydroelectric dams and plants and steel mills. The Soviet Union became a great industrial power, and this bedazzled the underdeveloped nations. What they failed to realize was a fact that has since become obvious to everyone: The Soviet Union produces more steel than it needs, but it can't feed its steel workers without importing food.

India is the classic case of a country that was misled by the "Soviet experiment." India concentrated all its capital and most of its foreign aid into building up industry. It used the free food it received from the U.S. to keep food prices low for industrial workers. The program has proved self-defeating. Low food prices have kept the Indian farmer too poor to provide a market for the goods the industrial workers are producing. At the same time, the low prices have discouraged the farmer from attempting to increase production.

Says Richard W. Reuter, director of Food-for-Peace: "The Indians said they were putting priority on agriculture in every one of their five-year programs, but agriculture was always the first place to get shortchanged when they ran out of money. This year, according to the Indian government's own minimum goals, there should be production of 1 million tons of nitrogenous fertilizer. In fact, production is less than 400,000 tons."

The U.S., Bell says, it not without blame for this situation. "We didn't use our maximum leverage to get the Indians to put more emphasis on agriculture. We saw what was wrong, but we didn't do enough about it."

Under the Food-for-Freedom program, the U.S. plans to get tough with India and the other underdeveloped nations. They will have to put agriculture first or they won't get aid. As a Department of Agriculture official puts it: "The President is going to lean hard on them."

The job of educating the Indian farmer to farm more efficiently will be a staggering one. There are 60 million farmers in the country, spread over 300 million acres of crop land. They speak 14 different languages. The overwhelming majority of them is illiterate.

BREAD VERSUS BULLETS

And yet, to say that India is hopeless is almost the same as saying that one day Red China will dominate all of Asia; India is the only other potential world power on the continent. Neither President Johnson nor Congress is willing to concede Asia to Red China, and, while they realize the difficulties in raising food production in underdeveloped countries, they can point to several notable triumphs in the past. In Greece, for example, the U.S. persuaded the government to give wheat farmers a better price and a guaranteed market, and the results, says Food-for-Peace Director Reuter, "were next to miraculous. They're now producing wheat till it comes out of their ears."

Undaunted by the difficulties, therefore, at least half a dozen congressmen already have introduced bills to implement the President's program. One of the first was Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY (Dem.) of North Carolina, chairman of the House Agricultural Committee. "I am convinced that, in the end, bread will be more important that bullets in bringing peace to the world," he says.

To be perfectly blunt about it, bread will be more important than bullets in assuring that the economic growth of the U.S. itself will continue.

U.S. BUSINESS VERSUS MALTHUS

It will take all the nation's economic resources to defeat the arithmetic of starvation. Obviously, the U.S. farmer will be the first to feel the impact of the Food-for-Freedom program. In a recent talk with midwestern grain dealers, Robert C. Liebenow, president of the Corn Industries Research Foundation, predicted that food exports under the program and through regular commercial sales would increase by 50% "within the next few years." They now amount to $6 billion a year. A 50% increase would bring them close to $9 billion. Land values are going to rise. Smart farmers with capital will become rich.

Major segments of U.S. industry are going to benefit, too. The menace of starvation will mean steadily mounting sales for the producers of fertilizers, farm machinery, seed and feed. According to Liebenow, in order to increase exports by 50%, the farmer will have to spend $3 billion a year more for those products than the $13 billion he spends now. Little wonder that farm machinery companies are expanding as fast as they can, that almost every major oil company is striving to build a major stake in fertilizer.

James Devlin, director of domestic agricultural sales of American Metal Climax, which makes fertilizer, goes further. Increased food exports, he says, will "affect the whole gross national product." The railroads will prosper, he points out, because the food must be shipped from farm to seaport by rail. The steel industry will profit because farm machinery is made of steel. Even the paper industry will profit, he says, noting: "We put our fertilizer in paper bags."

SHIPS AND SHIPPERS

"It will mean a lot more business for us," says Alvin Shapiro, executive vice president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, which represents the nation's shipowners, who will have to carry the foodstuffs and fertilizer and farm machinery abroad. He doubts, however, that it will have an immediate effect on the nation's shipbuilders because "there is still tremendous unused capacity around. The big tankers are excellent for shipping grain and are not being fully utilized." Increased exports also will mean a lot more business for such commercial grain shippers as Cargill and Continental Grain.

Claude W. Gifford, senior economist of Farm Journal, believes that, aside from the farmer, the makers of fertilizer will profit most from the Food-for-Freedom program. "You can get fertilizer on the land quickly," he says, "and it's easy to teach peasants how to use it even if they can't read. It's harder to teach the operation of machinery, and there's the problem of repairs."

This does not mean that manufacturers of farm machinery won't benefit, too, Gifford is quick to add, naming specifically Massey-Ferguson, Deere and International Harvester. Others who will benefit are seed companies like DeKalb, Northrup King and Pioneer, he says.

DEMAND FOR ROADS

Norman R. Urquhart, assistant vice president in charge of commodities of the economics department of the First National City Bank of New York, foresees a growing demand abroad for American earth-moving machinery. "When I was a boy growing up on an Illinois farm, one of the farmers' great cries was for good farm-to-market roads. We have them now, but the rest of the world needs them." This should help Caterpillar Tractor, he says. He also sees great opportunities for companies that build chemical plants, like Fluor, Foster Wheeler and Pullman's M. W. Kellogg division, "if they can get the contracts against foreign competition."

Some experts fear that increased production of foodstuffs in the U.S. and abroad actually may create a world shortage of fertilizers. Urquhart and one of First National's senior economists, Sam I. Nakagama, insist there is a world fertilizer cartel outside the U.S. Asked why U.S. companies don't attempt to break it, Nakagama says: "Perhaps they don't find it advantageous to do so."

Whatever the facts about this may be, according to Devlin of American Metal Climax, the world potash industry is geared to expand only at the rate of 6% to 7% a year. If demand rose to a 10% increase a year, Devlin admits, the industry wouldn't have the facilities to keep up with it for more than a few years. "We couldn't, in that time, bring out new mines," he says. Devlin doesn't believe that such a rise in demand is likely, but this view is far from unanimous.

One company that is all but certain to benefit is International Harvester. Says Hugh A. Davies, general manager of Harvester's overseas division: "We do research all over the world, in places ranging from Argentina, which is a net exporter of foodstuffs, to Africa, where the people eat bananas. We have facilities in 20 nations outside the U.S. We're in road-building, trucks and farm equipment. Only where farming is done by hand and horse do we not supply the tools. . . .

"We can fill any demands that come. We just hope that demand is created. Road-building might be a big thing. You have to have a way to get the food to market. The hinterland of Brazil is an example. You need better roads, schools, dams and irrigation channels."

Deere & Co., already the biggest farm machinery manufacturer in the U.S., is spending heavily to expand abroad. These investments have yet to pay off, but Chairman William A. Hewitt is sure they will. Meanwhile, he believes, the new farm policy will mean a big sales increase for his company in the U.S. White Motor, which got into farm machinery through a series of mergers, now gets 30% of its $638 million in sales from that business and is out for more. So are Allis-Chalmers and the revitalized J.I. Case.

Since the war against hunger can succeed only if the underdeveloped nations learn to produce more food, the U.S. Government is particularly anxious for U.S. manufacturers and food processors to expand abroad. Says AID Administrator David E. Bell: "There are lots of American companies beginning to invest abroad in fertilizer plants and there will be more in years to come. International Minerals & Chemical is putting up a big plant in India. We've recently made two loans for fertilizer plants in Korea; there the principal American investors are Gulf Oil and Swift. Now we are working with Standard of Indiana, Armour and others on fertilizer projects."

Bryson M. Filbert, vice president of Esso Chemical Co., says: "We have already invested about $90 million in facilities to produce ammonia, nitric acid and various other fertilizers and fertilizer compounds in Colombia, Aruba, Costa Rica, El Salvador and Spain. In addition, we are building or planning plants in the Philippines, Greece, Jamaica, Malaysia, Lebanon and Pakistan, as well as one in a very economically advanced nation, the Netherlands. In all, these plants will have more than 1 million tons of ammonia capacity and more than 1.8 million tons of fertilizer capacity. * * * Their capital cost will exceed $200 million."

The company also is working on new techniques which, it hopes, will make the sand dunes of Tunisia and Libya bloom. These involve using oil to stabilize them.

The U.S. Government is putting a great deal of pressure on the underdeveloped nations to make it attractive for U.S. companies to build fertilizer plants abroad. For a long time, India insisted that it handle all the distribution of fertilizers produced in that country by U.S. companies and that it also set the price. Standard of Indiana understandably refused to accept these conditions. AID put food shipments to India on a month-to-month basis until the Indian government let Standard of Indiana market the fertilizer itself at its own price.

OPPORTUNITY—AND PROBLEMS

Bell believes "there is a real opportunity in food processing." However, the food processors themselves think it may be a long time before they make any great progress in the underdeveloped countries. Harry Meisel, technical coordinator for Corn Products International, points out his company has sold a product derived from corn called "Maizena" which has been known for 100 years in Latin America. Recently, it brought out a new product in Brazil, "Enriched Maizena." This is "Maizena" with proteins, vitamins and minerals added. "It solves the problem of getting nutrition into the diet in an innocuous way," says Meisel. But Corn Products is losing money on "Enriched Maizena" because the protein element, which is made of milk and soybeans, costs too much. One reason is that it's been difficult to shift Brazilian farmers to soybean production. U.S. farmers will shift from one crop to another at the drop of a dollar, but in Brazil, caution and suspicion prevail. It takes 15 years to get a Brazilian farmer to shift crops, Meisel says. Introducing a new product in underdeveloped countries, he concludes, is "a baptism of blood."

Quaker Oats has been having a similar experience with "Incaparina." This is a powdered cereal mix that contains cottonseed and soy flour. Quaker Oats is promoting the cereal with an advertising campaign. Particularly effective have been movies which show babies before and after drinking the cereal.

"But," admits Michael Hore, general manager of Latin American and Pacific operations for Quaker, "we have a long way to go. It's a matter of education, and the money for that has to come from us."

Dr. Harold L. Wilcke, director of research for Ralston Purina, suspects there may be greater opportunities in the underdeveloped countries in processing food for animals than in food for humans. "In many areas," he says, "animals cannot economically compete in food value with direct consumption of grain. But in some areas, the land can grow food fit only for animals. These are areas similar to our Rocky Mountains, where grass is the only crop, and they exist in India, Mexico, and Venezuela. In addition, animals can compete when they scavenge or when they eat spoiled grains."

This could mean business for Ralston Purina's supplementary feeds, which help the animals grow faster and bigger, Dr. Wilcke says.

Clearly, the outlook is this: In the U.S., the economic impact of the Food-for-Freedom program will be swift. In the underdeveloped countries, however, the problems are as great as the need. For many of the companies that go overseas, these problems will make it difficult to show a profit for a long time. But for many the opportunity is simply too great to miss, whatever the risks.

The great 19th century clergyman-economist Thomas Malthus believed that population growth inevitably would outstrip food supply; only massive starvation and misery could re-right the balance, he said. It didn't happen that way in the countries of the West and in Japan, but it seems to be coming to that for the world as a whole. In the struggle to prove Malthus wrong, the know-how and enterprise of U.S. businessmen are going to prove mighty weapons.

THE TERRIBLE PATTER

In 1850, there were 1 billion people in the world. There are now 3.3 billion—more, it happens, than all the people who ever lived throughout all of history. The way things are going, in 15 years there will be 4 billion, and in 30 years, 6 billion. Those simple figures underlie the menace of what a worried writer calls "the terrible patter of tiny feet." The horrible fact is that 85% of this population increase will come from the underdeveloped countries which can't even support their present populations.

"Population control will have to go along with these agricultural programs," says Dr. Albert H. Moseman, AID Assistant Administrator for Technical Cooperation & Research, but he adds a warning: "We can insist only up to a certain point. It's a delicate situation. We could be accused of using potential starvation as a threat to get these people to do something against their own social values."

Dr. Moseman cites the case of India, where, he says, the infant mortality rate is so high, parents have to have six children to be able to have two or three survive to maturity. "As long as they still have to have all these children in order to have a few survive, you cannot convince them to cut down on the number of children they have," he says.

THE ANSWER

Some of the underdeveloped countries already have recognized the problem. Korea, Taiwan, Pakistan, India, Turkey, Colombia and Chile (the latter two are overwhelmingly Catholic) have birth control programs in various stages of development. The method being used in those places, according to Dr. Moseman, "is the plastic loop, an intrauterine device."

The loop was invented by a U.S. doctor, Jack Lippes, and is made in this country by his own company, the Hohabe Co. of Buffalo. It costs Hohabe about 25 cents to manufacture, package and distribute. Overseas, the Population Council, a Rockefeller-supported organization, distributes it free. Dr. Lippes also permits anyone to manufacture it abroad without restrictions and without paying royalties. In the underdeveloped countries, the cost of making the loop runs to about 2 cents.

Dr. Moseman believes the Lippes loop is the answer to "the terrible patter of tiny feet." Birth-control pills, he says, are "far too expensive" for people living in the underdeveloped countries.

According to Herbert J. Waters, AID's Assistant Administrator for Material Resources, Thailand is a good example of how a birth-control program can work. "In Thailand, they have a village mdiwife program," he says. "When a woman comes into the midwife station to get ready to have a baby, they set her up for the next time not to have a baby."

An Overmodest CIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which also appeared in the Sacramento Bee under date of July 7, 1966, is one which deserves the thoughtful consideration and reflection of every responsible member of the Federal Government:

[From the Sacramento Bee, July 7, 1966]

AN OVERMODEST CIA

Only in the most narrow and technical sense can it be considered accurate to say that the CIA has never made policy and never tried to influence a presidential decision. Those were the modest assurances which the agency's new director, Richard M. Helms, gave senators when the Armed Services Committee recommended approval of his nomination. They can scarcely be squared with the record of CIA operations in Iran, in Guatemala, in the Bay of Pigs invasion and in South Viet Nam.

Perhaps it is technically precise to say that the CIA does not make policy, but creates situations. This was certainly the case in the Bay of Pigs invasion, which from start to finish was a CIA enterprise, originated, as Arthur M. Schlesinger reports in "A Thousand Days", by CIA Director Allen Dulles and his assistant Richard M. Bissell Jr. By presenting a newly installed President with the situation of an exile force ready to invade Cuba with American training and support, the CIA created the circumstances under which the policy decision it wanted—the President's approval—was virtually assured.

This may not be making policy in the strict sense, but it is so close to it that the difference is not important.

Similarly in South Viet Nam it was the CIA that undertook to install Ngo Dinh Diem as head of a military anti-Communist government offering a military lodgment to the United States on the Asian mainland and thus undermining the neutralist basis of the 1954 Geneva settlement. Out of that situation grew on policy decision after another adding up to deep American involvement in an Asian land war.

It is true that at every stage of these and other CIA operations the agency obtained nominal approval from the National Security Council and the President. So the responsibility of its ventures has been widely shared. Yet it is a familiar fact of bureaucratic life that the agency which originates projects, controls the information about them and directs the day-to-day operations has an overwhelming influence upon the basic policy underlying them.

It is for this reason that the CIA ought to be kept under strict and severe control. That means, first of all, control by the President. We do not see how such control can be exercised unless very rigid restrictions are applied to the initiation of any clandestine operation (as distinct from the gathering of information) at the very beginning. It is not the American mission to go around the world setting up governments and knocking them down, and no governmental agency should enjoy carte blanche to engage in this business without strict supervision by the very highest responsible officials. That kind of supervision, applied with a heavy dose of skepticism as to the long-run effectiveness of cloak-and-dagger work, should cut the CIA's "dirty tricks" division to a minimum.

Effective control also means congressional knowledge of what is going on. We see no good reason why members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should not be added to the "watchdog" group now nominally responsible for keeping the CIA under review. That the agency's work vitally affects foreign policy is obvious, and the Senators who are responsible for reviewing our international relations should know what the CIA is doing all the time, early as well as late.

Midwest Governors Endorse Location of Bev Accelerator in Their Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the Midwestern Governors Conference adopted a number of resolutions at its fifth annual meeting held in Cincinnati on June 19 to 22, 1966. I think one of these resolutions, concerning the proposed atomic accelerator, is particularly worthy of the attention of the Congress. As we are all aware, the the Atomic Energy Commission has narrowed to a handful the number of sites under consideration for the 200 billion electron volt accelerator, three of which sites are located in the Midwest. At their annual meeting the Governors formally endorsed the location of the accelerator in the Midwest and urged that the AEC consider fully the Wisconsin, Michigan, and Illinois sites in making its decision.

I would like to add my voice to this endorsement, Mr. Speaker. For too long the Midwest has been a stepchild when the time came to award Government research and development contracts. It is time that the intellectual resources which the Midwest has been exporting to other parts of the Nation are provided with an opportunity to contribute to the region which trained them.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 1, PROPOSED ATOMIC ACCELERATOR

Whereas, construction of the proposed 200 BEV Atomic Accelerator in the Midwest would be a significant contribution to the continued economic growth of the area as well as a major factor in giving the Midwest a more vital role in the advancement of scientific research; and

Whereas, all three of the selected Midwestern sites being considered are characterized by having either the "nucleus of a strong accelerator design group", or one of the nation's outstanding Universities nearby; two of the most important criteria; and

Whereas, the proposed Midwestern sites have the natural and human resources, accessibility, good climate, and area available for experimental or expansion purposes; the prime prerequisites for site selection: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Midwestern Governors' Conference, That it formally endorses the location of the proposed 200 BEV Atomic Accelerator in the Midwest and urges the Atomic Energy Commission to consider, fully, the Stoughton (Wisconsin), Ann Arbor (Michigan), and Weston (Illinois) sites.

Responsible Accident Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, highway safety is a major issue confronting this session of Congress and is of great concern to the people of my State. I have long felt that more realistic and responsible reporting can contribute much to public understanding of the real human tragedy involved.

One of the best pieces of accident reporting I have ever seen was done by my good friend, Chuck Morrison, in a recent copy of the Casper, Wyo., Star-Tribune. So that his realistic insights may be shared with those of us dealing in the abstractions of policy, I request unanimous consent that his contribution be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

PHOTOGRAPHER ON WRECKS: YOU NEVER GET USED TO IT

(By Chuck Morrison)

The wail of a siren cuts the night air, the phone in the news room has that sound of emergency that only a phone seems to have at times. "Bad accident above Garden Creek turnoff.". The voice is shouting and nervous. You jump into your car and head toward the scene.

Flashing red and yellow amber lights stab the darkness on the road, a Highway Patrol unit with sirens shrilling, passes in a hurry. You pull up to the scene of the accident. A Volkswagen is grotesquely hung in a guard rail on its side, in the middle of the road is the ambulance with its red lights flickering, sideways. Spotlights stab down the side of the boulder strewn mountain. You pick out white ambulance attendants, volunteers and patrol officers struggling with an overturned car.

The accident victim is pulled from the wreckage, blood whips across the sagebrush and across the faces and clothes of rescue workers.

The wind is blowing a terrific gale and it is bitter cold. From the makeshift stretcher, comes the soft sucking sound of air as the injured man fights to breathe. His left arm flops aimless, and his face is badly smashed. It is a sound you never get used to—it is the sound of the dying.

The ambulance attendant stumbles, and the injured man falls off the side of the stretcher. He is picked up, placed in the center and they struggle upward, someone falls and the victim is pitched off again. Finally he is placed in the ambulance along with the walking injured for the long ride to the emergency room at the hospital.

Three doctors work feverishly to save a life, the night nursing supervisor is helping the emergency room nurse give oxygen. Blood pressure keeps dropping, and the physicians work against time and shock.

Short, terse orders are coming from the shrouded curtain that surrounds the injured man. The situation becomes tense, every effort is made by the three physicians to save the young man.

It's too late. Shock, loss of blood, and other injuries take their toll of another highway victim. It's 10:55 a.m.

Outside in the waiting room, a relative of the victim becomes hysterical, a quick call is put in for help. Police officers arrive within minutes and get him quieted down. A phone call is made to the next of kin.

Meanwhile, on the mountain road, a patrolman is busy trying to keep traffic moving. The morbid curious are attracted by the flashing lights. "What happened?" a head shouts from a passing car, "Can't you see there has been an accident," a patrolman says. "Yes, but what happened?"

The wrecker men move in with quick deliberate jerks of their vehicles. One attaches a cable to keep the small foreign car from whipping off the mountain road. The other moves across boggy mountain sod to the fatal car.

"What's your name, son?" asks the patrolman as he questions the driver of the Volkswagen.

He hands the patrol officer his driver's license. "Been drinking?" says the officer, "Yes, but only one beer!" "What speed were you going?" "Oh maybe 50 or 60 mph." "What happened?" "Well this other car started to pass me on the curve and that's all I know . . ." The officer continues writing out his accident report. "Were you wearing seat belts?" he asks, and continues taking notes.

A Sheriff's deputy comes up after directing traffic away from the accident scene.

"Need any help with your measuring tape, Harry?" They move off down the mountain road in the cold wind measuring the long black skid marks made by the two vehicles.

The wrecker men continue their methodic cleaning up. Glass is swept up, a boot picked up, a beer stein thrown into the blood spattered front seat along with papers, personal belongings, pieces of the car.

"All wrapped up, Harry. How about a hot cup of coffee when we get down. Okay?"

The patrol cars move on down the mountain, the wreckers slowly pace their way down the road with their broken cargo.

You never get used to them.

Ken Bruning, a Fine American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the death of Ken Bruning of Levittown, N.Y., long a leader in the Disabled American Veterans both in Long Island and nationally, is a sad loss for his community, for the organization he served so well, and for the Nation.

Ken Bruning lost his sight as a result of his service to the Nation during World War II. Yet, in spite of this greatest of physical handicaps, he fashioned a constructive career, raised a wonderful family, gave unsparingly of himself to the causes in which he believed, and was never heard to complain.

To me, Ken Bruning exemplified the quiet courage of the thousands of Americans who have given and are giving far more than the rest of us so that we all might live in freedom.

In a memorable press conference, President John F. Kennedy suggested that life is not always fair in its demands upon those who serve the Nation. Jack Kennedy's death was tragic testimony to the truth of his words.

It is sad but true that some give everything including their lives, the greatest gift of all, while others give little or nothing. We do not know why.

I know this: Ken Bruning can take a place of honor in the company of our Nation's heroes.

His quiet courage has won for him our deepest admiration and of him it can be truly said: Here was a man.

L.B.J.'s Foreign Policy Successes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, self-criticism has long been an attribute of the American character. No person or policy can expect to avoid vigorous inspection from our press, our political leadership and from various public forums.

In recent months American foreign policy has been undergoing an intensive and extensive study by all of these groups. Critical study is, of course, necessary and helpful, but I cannot help feeling that many observers have become overly concerned with what is wrong with our foreign relations and have neglected to consider a growing roster of successes that have become evident.

Life magazine has, I believe, succeeded in reminding us of many of the positive results of the administration's foreign policy. Their editorial of June 24, 1966, has brought into perspective many recent occurrences in Asia, Latin American, and Europe. As a broad overview of President Johnson's world policy, the editorial has served to strike a much needed note of optimism. I applaud their calm reappraisal and commend the editorial to my colleagues:

[From Life magazine, June 24, 1966]

L.B.J.'s FOREIGN POLICY SUCCESSES

The Johnson administration has been looking for fresh ideas and initiatives in foreign policy. Examples are the President's espousal of a "summit meeting" of Latin American leaders and of regional development programs in Africa. Others probably lie ahead. Some White House advisers exude a new mood of resolute optimism. Johnson's critics dismiss all this as an "exercise in rhetorical rejuvenation" or attribute it to the White House fears of the coming congressional elections based on Johnson's own bad showing in recent polls. Yet a glance at the major sectors of U.S. foreign policy will show that a measure of optimism is not out of place.

Let us start with Europe. On the anniversary of D-day last fortnight, peace in Europe had lasted one day longer than it did between World Wars I and II. As it passed this milestone Europe had less reason to expect another war than at any time since the Cold War began. This despite De Gaulle's efforts to dismantle NATO. Even De Gaulle counts on the natural coherence of the Atlantic world, and its U.S. nuclear umbrella, for ultimate security. Meanwhile the changes in NATO are echoed by fissures in the Warsaw Pact, and the so-called "satellites" of Eastern Europe show increasing independence of Moscow.

In Asia there is a grisly war, but it is not a very dangerous one either to the U.S. or to world peace. Moreover, the news from Vietnam is so much better than a year ago that Johnson and McNamara ought to be taking bows instead of brickbats. The fierce battle in the central highlands—a "spoiling attack" on General Giap's North Vietnamese troop concentrations—is another sign that the initiative has moved to U.S. and Vietnamese forces. The casualty ratio: the enemy desertion rate; the increased mobility, firepower and morale of Westmoreland's troops, all justify his confidence that he can handle the "monsoon offensive" which Giap may be preparing. Even the Saigon political situation looks more stable on the first anniversary of the Ky directory.

Red China is going through a purge, the first major split in its leadership since the Mao regime took power. It *may* signal the end of that regime and its successor *may* be less bellicose and more concerned with China's enormous internal problems. Maoism has lost all influence in Indonesia, whose new leaders have just terminated Sukarno's insane war on Malasia and seem to be steering their unfortunate country back to ways of order and sense.

Indeed a new Asia is beginning to take shape. Perhaps its birthplace will be recorded as Seoul, the capital of an even bloodier war than Vietnam's only 15 years ago. In Seoul last week the foreign ministers of nine free Asian and Pacific countries—Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, the Philippines, South Vietnam, Malaysia, Australia and New Zealand—met to discuss their mutual desire to cooperate on trade, development and other common problems. For the first time the new men of Asia (as Thei Foreign Affairs Minister Thanat Khoman put it) "are getting together without being influenced by any of the former colonial powers." The initiative came from the proud leaders of the Republic of Korea, a successful new nation (economic growth rate almost eight percent a year) anxious to assert its Asian identity.

This new free-Asian regionalism is indigenous, not made in America, and it is welcomed by U.S. policy makers. The U.S. role is mainly to give it financial and technical aid, as through the Mekong Basin project and the Asian Development Bank.

In Latin America our main regional agencies are the Alliance for Progress and the Organization of American States. In what was widely criticized as his major blunder, President Johnson broke the letter of the nonintervention treaty on which the O.A.S. was founded when he unilaterally sent over 22,000 U.S. troops to quell the Dominican rebellion of April '65. That "blunder" does not look so bad today.

Johnson intervened, so he said at the time, solely to save lives and to assure a free election. He has succeeded in both. His intervention enabled the O.A.S. to take control of the troops of six nations (mostly U.S.) that have kept substantial peace for a year in the Dominican Republic. O.A.S. picked the provisional president, Garcia-Godoy, whose disinterested integrity made the recent election possible. O.A.S. oversaw the voting and can now withdraw its remaining 8,000 soldiers as soon as the new president-elect, Joaquin Balaguer, agrees.

Balaguer campaigned on a promise of civil peace, and the Dominicans, especially the rural women, supported him with a landslide. One can even hope that the Dominicans, despite their long history of violence and tyranny, are now on the road to successful self-government. Hats should be off to Garcia-Godoy, to the U.S. representative to the O.A.S., Ellswoth Bunker, and to all others who made possible this success story(knock wood) of inter-American diplomacy. And not just diplomacy. Democracy also had a victory. The right of a people to choose their own government is the essential principle at issue in our struggle with Communism. Whenever a people freely exerts that right, our side scores a political victory of a kind that our adversaries can't answer.

An even more crucial election is scheduled in Vietnam in September. Some U.S. policy makers are gloomy about it, since the Vietcong will try to sabotage it and the Buddhists threaten not to participate. Yet the very prospect of an election, and Marshal Ky's evidently serious preparations for it, have already strengthened the directory. The U.S. has every reason to cheer the plans for this election. It could well result in the first broad popular base for a government in Saigon, and so make the political side of the war as hopeful as the military.

Johnsonian foreign policy has not been uniformly successful, nor should it get credit for all its own recent good news. But neither has it been the series of disasters some of Johnson's critics love to wallow in. We must be doing something right, for aggression is being contained, regional institutions of order are developing, some new countries are thriving, and there is even a little permeation of the Iron Curtain (as in Willy Brandt's East-West German conversations). If Johnson is serious in his talk of new initiatives in foreign policy, the time is opportune. He should ignore the polls when he knows that a policy is the right one, such as his attempt at bridge-building in Eastern Europe. The little outcroppings of sense, decency and hope now visible around the world prove that good policies sometimes have their reward. And there are ample opportunities ahead for U.S. policy to continue trying to make the world at least somewhat safer both for democracy and for diversity.

Patriotism Pledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Inter-High School Student Council of the Buffalo Public Schools, Buffalo, N.Y., developed a patriotism pledge to remind the Nation's adults that the overwhelming majority our young people are responsible individuals who are deeply appreciative of their heritage and grateful for their blessings as American citizens. They secured more than 12,000 voluntary signatures during the closing days of this school year. This is particularly impressive in view of the fact that the council was hampered in its efforts by final examinations, graduations, and other end-of-year activities.

A volume containing the pledge and signatures has been forwarded to President Lyndon B. Johnson by the Superintendent of Schools in Buffalo, Dr. Joseph Manch.

The members of this student council are to be highly commended, and it is a privilege for me to call this action to the attention of my colleagues.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the patriotism pledge developed by the student council follows:

In these troubled and uncertain times, there is a need to stop and think about what makes our Nation great.

We the Students, of the Public High Schools of Buffalo, New York, do pledge our support to the principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States of America.

We consider ourselves fortunate to be living in this Nation. We wish to acknowledge our faith in its leaders.

Chairman L. Mendel Rivers Impresses San Diego

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during the July 4 recess, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, made a fast-moving inspection tour of several military facilities in the country.

He was warmly received by the public throughout his tour as is evidenced by the knowledgeable editorial which appeared in the July 11, 1966, issue of the San Diego Union:

NO CALCULATED RISK: REPRESENTATIVE RIVERS BUILDING ON FACTS

Unfortunately, the visit of Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat of South Carolina, to San Diego was all too brief. Fortunately, however, the afterglow of warm feeling and confidence he left remains.

Of particular comfort to all of the United States of America, as well as San Diego, is the fact that a person of Mr. RIVERS' opinions, stature and leadership is chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

As an expert on military affairs, an energetic congressman who inexhaustibly seeks the truth and is a bluntly outspoken person when he finds it necessary, Mr. RIVERS is a refreshing figure in government.

His visit to San Diego for part of a day when he was on vacation is illustrative of his dedication. Earlier in the day he had inspected defense installations in Mobile, Ala.

He flew to San Diego to inspect defense plants, visit with squadrons at Miramar Naval Air Station that had just returned from Viet Nam, tour the Marine Corps Recruit Depot and hold a press interview.

On the following day, while still on "vacation" during a recess of Congress, Mr. RIVERS continued his tour of other California defense plants and military installations.

Here is a man with an inexhaustible store of information about defense who takes personal vacation time to keep his knowledge current almost to the hour. The result will be the best possible defense laws and appropriations the nation can have.

Such dedication leaves a comforting feelings that all will be well with our security. The feeling is bolstered by the words Mr. RIVERS speaks.

Mr. RIVERS firmly believes that Congress has a major role in determining the defense and security of our nation, as the Constitution specifies.

Like many military leaders he believes the war in Viet Nam should be fought according to the science of the military profession, developed through the years. He understands the military system and defense and is not a bit interested in the theory of "calculated risk" so far as survival of our nation is concerned.

The House Armed Services Committee chairman also advocates fighting the war in Viet Nam on a military basis, striking all strategic targets with our defense might. When called a "hawk," he asks: "who do you want fighting your war, a hawk or a dove?"

And above all, he shows his appreciation to the military men for the sacrifices they are making and the task of defense they are performing. He translates the appreciation into tangible benefits from Congress.

Best interests of the United States of America would be better served if the Pentagon fully heeded the advice of Rep. RIVERS and the men he champions as our experienced military leaders.

Grand Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of Sunday, July 3, 1966, contained a forceful and thought-provoking column by Irston R. Barnes, chairman of the Audubon Naturalist Society. The column deals with a subject of some concern to me, and one that all of us in the House will be called to consider in the coming weeks. I should like to include an excerpt from it at this point in the RECORD:

THE NATURALIST: CASH BEFORE BEAUTY AT GRAND CANYON?

(By Irston R. Barnes)

Many Americans are puzzled; with a forthright leader of the New Conservation in the White House and a highly articulate spokesman for natural and wilderness values as Secretary of the Interior, how is it possible for the Bureau of Reclamation to be promoting two new dams on the edges of Grand Canyon National Park, Marble Gorge, above the park, and Bridge Canyon, below. The lower dam will back up water into the park and require construction within it.

Both dams will drown out 130 miles of some of the finest scenery in the Grand Canyon. They will, by impounding its waters, kill the Colorado River as a living geologic force.

Neither dam will serve a public or economic purpose. Indeed, the Bureau of Reclamation wants to "borrow" a billion-odd dollars, at less than the interest cost to the Treasury, to be repaid out of revenues after completing payments on the Hoover, Parker and Davis dams!

Both new dams are a part of the Bureau's power projects. They are not to conserve water. Instead, they will increase evaporation losses by enough to supply both Phoenix and Tuscon.

The Bureau's Rube Goldberg stunt is to generate electric power and use the revenues to finance pumping water to Arizona from an existing reservoir and to reimburse southern California by bringing water from the Columbia River.

Unfortunately for the Bureau's antiquarian economics, before the existing Glen Canyon dam (now only half full) and the new dams can begin producing electricity, equivalent power from cheaper sources will be available. So the Bureau's "cash register dams" (its own designation) would destroy the living Colorado, its priceless scenery, waste water in a water deficit region, and misuse public funds at vast cost to the taxpayers.

Lt. Alexander F. Morze Receives Commendation Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very fine article entitled, "Local Soldier Receives Commendation Medal," which appeared in a recent edition of the Gardner News concerning my esteemed friend and constituent, 1st Lt. Alexander F. Morze.

The article cites the fact that Lieutenant Morze displayed "a high degree of aggressiveness, tactical proficiency, and deep appreciation for material readiness." In addition, he received the highest rating within his battalion during a command maintenance inspection conducted by higher headquarters in Germany.

This is but one honor conferred upon Lieutenant Morze whose sister, Miss Beverly A. Morze, is a very efficient secretary in my office. Lieutenant Morze continues to have a splendid record in the Army, and time and time again he has distinguished himself and demonstrated his fidelity to duty, his superb qualities of positive leadership, and his constant concern for his troops and the overall needs of the service.

This fine young officer is in the best traditions of the Army, and I am confident that he will continue in the future with the same high type of dedicated, devoted service to the Nation that he has performed during the time that he has been in the Army.

In congratulating him and his family upon this honor, I wish for him and them continued success and happiness. It is young men like Lieutenant Morze who are the real assurance of the present and the hope of the future.

The article follows:

LOCAL SOLDIER RECEIVES COMMENDATION MEDAL

The Army Commendation Medal has been awarded to 1st. Lt. Alexander F. Morze, of this city for meritorious service from Jan. 1964 to April of 1966. During the period cited, Lt. Morze distinguished himself by meritorious service as Tank Platoon Leader and Support Platoon Leader of Company B and Bn S4 and Bn Property Book Officer while serving as a member of the 3/37th Armor 4th Armored Division. As Tank Platoon Leader, Lt. Morze displayed a high degree of aggressiveness, tactical proficiency and deep appreciation for material readiness. His Platoon received the highest rating within the battalion during a Commander Maintenance Inspection conducted by Higher Headquarters in April 1964; and in the company and platoon Army Training Tests at Holenvels, Germany, in February 1965.

Lt. and Mrs. Morze, daughter Karen 5 years old, and son Phillip, 20 months, arrived in Gardner the 23rd of May for a 30-day furlough and are now living in Columbia, S.C., where Lt. Morze is stationed at Fort Jackson, S.C., as an officer in charge of a combat range.

Lt. Morze is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Alexander Morze of State Road, Westminster;

Mrs. Morze (Margaret) is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Weeks, 129 Elm Street.

The Unwelcome Troublemaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, Chicago suffered from complications which were fed additional fuel by uninvited agitators. This practice, uninvited agitation, adding confusion to a local scene and creating havoc, has prevailed elsewhere in the country. WBBM-TV discussed the subject in their editorial "The Unwelcome Troublemaker," in a most practical fashion.

The editorial follows:

THE UNWELCOME TROUBLEMAKER

(Presented by Carter Davidson, editorial director of WBBM-TV, Friday, June 24, 1966)

It isn't often that street rioting has any result other than the destruction of property and the letting of blood. The Division Street uprising of two weeks ago in Chicago's Puerto Rican colony was an exception. It brought about some prompt and beneficial results. Some 150 Chicago policemen will start Monday in an accelerated course in the Spanish language to counter the complaint that the language barrier prevents communication between Police and Puerto Ricans. A Puerto Rican editor, Claudio Flores, was inducted this week into membership on the Human Relations Commission. The Board of Education is sharply increasing its English language classes in Spanish-speaking neighborhoods.

Perhaps more important, although less visible, is the new awareness on the part of political leaders that the Puerto Rican community can no longer be ignored, as it had so woefully been for so long. You can credit the street violence for much of the push that brought about these benefits.

There is, unfortunately, a possibility that those benefits will be more than offset by the threat of an ill-advised march on City Hall by Puerto Ricans, scheduled for next Tuesday. The agitation for the march is being sparked by an unwelcome troublemaker from New York's Puerto Rican community. Chicago's own Puerto Rican leaders say they want no part of such an unnecessary demonstration.

In the first place, most of the demands to be made by the New York troublemakers already are being met. In the second place, the Chicagoans wisely want to avoid any spectacle that could create new tensions of the sort that caused the Division Street uprising in the first place.

Until the rioting two weeks ago, most Chicagoans were unaware of the wretched plight of the Puerto Rican community.

Years of neglect by the politicians who were supposed to represent them, plus the fact that three out of four Puerto Ricans are unable to speak proper English, had virtually sealed the Spanish-speaking community off from the rest of the city.

When the facts became known, because of the rioting, there was a shock wave of understanding and sympathy for the Puerto Ricans, even though no one condones violence and the burning of police cars.

It will be the Puerto Rican's loss if that sympathy and understanding is flushed away by an unnecessary demonstration—led by an unwanted outsider—next Tuesday.

Rampart Dam Is a Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the July 3 "Today" supplement of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer contained an excellent article entitled "Rampart Dam Is a Fraud." Its author, Blaine Freer, is a vigorous conservationist and outdoor writer and in this article drew from an address he recently delivered in Anchorage, Alaska.

I have long opposed construction of the Rampart Dam which has been proposed on the Yukon River northwest of Fairbanks. This opposition is shared by many Alaskans who have written me and likewise is opposed by conservationists throughout the entire Nation.

In the hope that other voices in America will join in the outcry "Don't do this to Alaska," I am placing Mr. Freer's article at this point:

RAMPART DAM IS A FRAUD

(By Blaine Freer)

Although less has been said about the destruction of wildlife other than waterfowl which the proposed Rampart Dam would inflict, these other losses have a far greater significance to Alaska. Like the salmon, for instance. All five Pacific species of salmon run up the Yukon, and a great portion of them would be destroyed. And two of the most valued species, kings and silvers, would be the two suffering the greatest loss.

Here is a unique fish. Because of the great distance traveled up the Yukon to their spawning streams, the Yukon king and silver are superior fish to those spawning closer to the salt water. They are stronger, with richer, oilier flesh.

There is no way that the great bulk of them could be saved if Rampart is built. To believe that fish passage facilities could be constructed to surmount the 530-foot height of Rampart, that adult fish could then find their way through the vastness of the impoundment to their spawning streams, and that the hatched fry could then find their way down the lake, through the dam and out to sea, would mark you as a wishful thinker of the first magnitude. The most feasible solution would be to build hatcheries below the dam, but at enormous expense, and also at a loss of the unique qualities of the Yukon salmon.

Lost, too, would be all wildlife now residing in the impoundment area. This would include in excess of 12,000 moose, as well as grizzly bear, black bear, possibly some dall sheep; and smaller game such as beavers, mink, muskrat, otter, martin, weasel, wolverine, lynx, fox, wolves, coyotes, snowshoe hares, red squirrels, grouse and ptarmigan.

All of these would be lost for all time, because there is nowhere for them to go. We have been told that many would merely move to another suitable area. But you don't have to be a game biologist to understand that this is not true. Common sense will tell you that other suitable habitat for these species would already be occupied.

You may fly over areas of Alaska in a plane and see much marshland that is little used by ducks and geese. It would be easy to assume, without giving it any real thought, that the waterfowl could move in there after the spreading waters of Rampart had driven them out. But this is not true. A great many of the northern lakes in both Canada and Alaska are too sterile to provide nourishment. After all, water is only one requirement. A duck needs food, too.

Only at the expenditure of an enormous amount of money and effort could other habitat be made suitable to salvage even a small portion of the wildlife that Rampart would destroy.

Now, if Rampart Dam were to serve some useful purpose, if it were to truly contribute to the wealth of Alaska, or to the security of the nation, then it would be necessary to make whatever effort was required to salvage some part of the loss, and to accept with what good will we could muster, the permanent destruction of all the rest.

But Rampart is a fraud.

We are told that it will supply Yukon power for America, and to provide the necessary power for Alaska industry. What we are not told is that the real purpose of Rampart is to lay hands on somewhere up to two billion dollars of federal funds. We all know that the economy of Alaska, both as a territory and as a state, has been based on military spending. When that spending starts to subside, Alaska feels the pinch. And what better way, according to the thinking of some, than to devise a project that will funnel in more federal money? Which is a legitimate aim. We have no quarrel with the concept, and certainly an economically stable Alaska is highly desirable.

But better to funnel the money toward something that would have some value, like road construction, which would really contribute to Alaska's well being.

Let's take a good, hard look at Rampart, and see just how necessary it really is. Let's take a look at Yukon Power for America. Recently a special study team, commissioned by the Natural Resources Council of America and headed by Dr. Stephen H. Spurr of the University of Michigan school of graduate studies, completed its findings. From that report I quote:

"Even today, it would appear to be cheaper to build a nuclear plant on the Pacific Coast rather than to transmit Rampart power south, even writing off the cost of the Rampart project as a total loss."

The Spurr team also agreed with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's apprehensions about the destruction of wildlife resources, but called them conservative.

It would be necessary, of course, in transmitting Yukon power to the Lower 48 to cross Canadian soil, a fact which doesn't receive universal indorsement on the part of Canada. As a matter of fact Arthur Laing, Canadian Minister of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources, has stated that Canada does not desire power transmission lines crossing its territory.

He also objects to Rampart on the basis that it would prevent Canada from developing its own watersheds, and that besides, the Treaty of 1871 requres the Yukon River be kept open for navigation.

As far as Yukon power being required to stimulate Alaskan industry, this is a complete fallacy, and I am sure that those who advocate it don't really believe it themselves.

How do you think Alaskan industry could compete against Midwest and eastern industry when manufacturers in those areas are already hard-pressed by foreign imports? Who now makes nearly all the transistor radios in the world? Is now the world's leading shipbuilder? Makes two-thirds of the motorcycles? Now ranks fourth in production of motor cars and is beginning to give Detroit nightmares?

Before you get too many woolly dreams about Alaska industry, start getting realistic about what it takes to compete and survive.

We will imagine that some small industry, by its particular and unique nature, could be located in Alaska and could survive the crucible of competitive world trade. If one is still thinking in terms of hydroelectric power there are a number of places where smaller dams could be erected which would have little or no adverse affect on wildlife, and maybe even enhance the recreational resources of the area. Certainly if those who seek power for a yet unconceived Alaska industry are truly sincere, they would seek every means possible to obtain the power without wreaking the havoc that would be caused by Rampart.

They would also explore the possibility of atomic power.

Already the march toward nuclear power for domestic and industrial use has begun. In this regard I would like to quote from a recent speech by L. E. Karrer, senior vice president of Puget Sound Power and Light, before the Industrial Bureau of the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce:

"Based on present technology, it appears that by the middle '70's generation of electricity by atomic energy will be commonplace and, hopefully, competitive. How important is this trend? Several points stand out which I think are important to you as customers. There are presently only about 1,000,000 kilowatts of atomic energy power plants operating in the United States. This is about half the size of Grand Coulee. There are another 2 million kilowatts under construction, and another 4,600,000 programmed. It is presently estimated that by 1970 there will be about 9 million kilowatts of installed nuclear capacity in the United States; that by 1975 this will be increased to about 13,000,000 kilowatts; by 1980—a mere 14 years away—to 90 million kilowatts; and by the year 2000, to 700 million.

"As you look into the future, it is obvious that greater emphasis will be placed on the generation of electric power through the use of the atom. In fact, I am advised that in the northeastern part of the country, and in the State of California, additional electric generating facilities presently planned are of the nuclear variety. In Europe, due to the fuel shortage and population explosion, they are far ahead of us in number and capacity of nuclear plants.

"All this means that the technology associated with nuclear power will advance rapidly in the decades to come. Already substantial economies in fuel processing and use are deemed possible. New construction methods forecast lower capital investment."

What does this mean to Rampart? Merely that if it is not now obsolete, it surely will be by the time the first electricity flows from its turbines.

I should here make some comments directed specifically at the Army Corps of Engineers.

I am sure they are accustomed to criticism. we all are, in some degree, because just about anything we do may be criticized in some way or another. But it becomes bearable, and even stimulating, when you know that what action you took was right.

Certainly the Corps of Engineers comes under a barrage of criticism. Every dam it builds will find the barbs of those particular interests—like steelheaders and salmon fishermen—who feel that it does them injury.

Naturally they have come to expect this, and there is little sting if they can see the benefits that the dam brings in other ways. However in this era of increased awareness of the need to protect our wildlife and our natural resources, and to preserve the wild and primitive character of the land wherever possible, it becomes doubly important for them to be sure of what they're doing.

It has been claimed that the electroprocess industries, which require enormous amounts of power, could be competitive in spite of it all by the mere fact of having low cost power. Once again referring to the Spurr Report, it stated that minerals are not known to exist in quantities in Alaska sufficient to attract such industries.

In summary of our objections to Rampart on the basis that it would serve no useful purpose, we refer once again to the Spurr Report which concludes that Rampart would be a great gamble, would grievously damage fish, wildlife and related resources, and states that there are logical and feasible alternative power sources which can meet Alaskan needs.

We from down below treasure the dream and the image of Alaska that we carry in our hearts and in our minds. It's the dream of a grimy steelworker hoping some day to save the money to take his family on a fabulous Alaska vacation. It's the dream of an office worker who sees himself on a stream, filled with huge and hungry trout. It's the dream of a hunter imagining a huge moose filling the sights of his rifle, who pictures himself peering over a craggy rock and seeing a full curl ram, unsuspecting and within range.

It's the dream of all Americans who have seen their land despoiled by greed and a lack of concern for the future, and who cry out, "Don't do this to Alaska."

Jet Noise: A Plea for Bipartisan Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation and for other purposes. I am pleased to sponsor this legislation following its introduction by the distinguished chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Honorable Harley O. Staggers.

The aircraft noise abatement bill comes to the Congress with the support of the White House and the Federal Aviation Agency. The bill is a direct result of the White House Conference on Aircraft Noise, held on October 29, 1965, in answer to my request to the President by letter of August 19, 1965, and the report of the President's Task Force on Noise Abatement, headed by the President's Science Adviser, Dr. Donald F. Hornig. While my present view is that the bill does not go far enough it is nevertheless a constructive step forward in the direction of an ultimate solution. It represents at least a recognition from the highest level of Government, that jet noise is a problem, national in scope, requiring action on the executive, congressional, and administrative levels.

The identification of jet noise as a national problem was the major objective of my efforts during 1965 to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House the seriousness of the noise problem and its effect upon the daily lives of millions of Americans—men, women, and children—who reside near our Nation's airports. I have addressed myself to this problem on 12 separate occasions in the House and have introduced 2 bills, H.R. 7981 and H.R. 7982, to help solve the problem of aircraft noise.

I am pleased that hearings on legislation to alleviate this problem will be scheduled shortly and that all bills on this subject will be reviewed and studied by the committee. I will make every effort to strengthen the legislation along the lines of my bill H.R. 7982 in an effort to bring the resources of the Federal Government to both local governments and to private industry, to share the cost of developing noise reduction techniques on airports as well as aircraft. I favor and will propose amendments to provide Federal funds to pay for part of the cost of implementing noise reduction techniques.

The bill which I have introduced today along with the distinguished committee chairman authorizes the FAA or the proposed Department of Transportation to set noise standards and regulations and to use these standards in connection with the issuance, amendment, or revocation of certificates authorized by title VI of the Federal Aviation Act. This is an important step in the direction of alleviating the noise problem and I am hopeful this effort will not be delayed, thwarted or frustrated by those who would make this issue a political one. Jet noise affects many millions of Americans—of both political parties—and the effort to attack this problem should be a bipartisan effort.

I have today written to the chairman of the New York State delegation steering committee, the Honorable Emanuel Celler, requesting that the entire delegation consider giving its endorsement to aircraft noise abatement legislation on a bipartisan basis and take the issue out of partisan politics.

I have also requested the chairman of the New York steering committee to consider appointing an ad hoc committee of New York Members to work with Members from other States in arriving at a united position on the legislation and on proposed amendments to strengthen the legislation. By coordinating the effort in this bipartisan manner, we can move forward in the battle against aircraft which pollutes our environment and disrupts the daily lives of millions of our citizens.

Hawaii Continues To Show Outstanding Gains in Personal Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a recent survey showed that Hawaii continues to occupy its enviable position as one of the Nation's top leaders in personal income percentage gains.

A survey of the first 4-month period in 1966 by the Business Week magazine revealed that Hawaii had a 13.2 percent increase over last year's figure for the same period. This percentage gain is second only to Iowa's 14.4 percent increase.

It is with considerable pride, therefore, that I submit for inclusion in the Congressional Record the newspaper article which reported the personal income percentage gains for Hawaii. It apeared in the June 27, 1966 issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

PERSONAL INCOME HERE KEEPS CLIMBING

Hawaii continues to be among the leading states in the percentage gain in personal income over comparable periods last year.

The Business Week survey shows that Hawaii had total personal income of $184.2 million in April, 14.8 percent over the $160.5 million reported for April, 1965.

This increase was surpassed only by North Dakota's 18.6 percent gain, due to start of work on a missile base.

For the first four months Hawaii reported $733.6 million, up 13.2 percent over the $647.8 million in the same four-month span last year.

This also is the second highest increase, outdistanced only by Iowa, which reported a 14.4 percent increase.

What Price Competence?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Paul L. Davies, chairman of the executive committee of FMC Corp., San Jose, Calif., delivered a most interesting keynote speech at the annual meeting of the Manufacturing Chemists' Association entitled "What Price Competence?"

Mr. Davies' speech dealt with the problem of attracting the best possible people into Government service and, in my opinion, is a most significant presentation, which deserves the attention of the entire Congress. Therefore, I submit the entire text of Mr. Davies' speech except for the introductory remarks:

WHAT PRICE COMPETENCE?

So many subjects came to mind that could be profitably discussed, that it was difficult to single out just one. For example, the subject of guideposts on wage increases merits attention. Are these guideposts a boon to labor by establishing floors to start from, or are they helping to keep wage increases at a more reasonable level than might otherwise exist?

Another likely topic relates to taxes. Would a tax increase really discourage the threat of inflation and the "over-heating" of our economy, or are we at a point in the business cycle where we should be concerned with deflation instead of inflation in the months ahead?

The balance of payments problem presents another meaty topic. Can our deficit balance and our declining gold reserves be rectified by voluntary measures, or should we adopt mandatory controls over imports, foreign travel, and foreign investments? As a corollary to this, is it realistic to discourage foreign investments? Don't they represent our "best bet" for curing our balance of payments problem over the long term? Would other restrictive measures, such as limiting unproductive foreign aid in areas of the world where we are not appreciated be more appropriate?

No list of potential subjects would be complete without considering the Viet Nam conflict. It seems like everyone is discussing and "cussing" the subject. In complex world problems of this type, not one of us is knowledgeable enough to express sound opinions. Consequently, no matter what our political affiliations may be, I believe we should support the policy of our Administration. If we are convinced that the Administration policy is wrong, isn't it better to work toward changing the administration, rather than to weaken our world leadership image in the eyes of our enemies and friends through a national display of diffidence and diversity?

Among numerous other subjects deserving attention is the problem of the Federal Budget. Is it in our national interest to have a deficit budget during the most prosperous period our economy has ever experienced? If so, then we must reconcile ourselves to the realization that the dollar is going to be worth less and less as this philosophy continues. As opposed to this concept should we accept international unrest as a "normal" way of life and try to reduce non-essential government spending in order to offset increased defense expenditures in time of "abnormal" tension?

There are many other subjects in the national interest that I considered developing for discussion, but I finally concluded that every subject eventually related to our Government, our Administration, our over-all policies, and the people all along the line who make and execute these policies. So, after screening and attempting to refine and define all of this into a single topic that we could examine and evaluate together, I decided that the key to all of the problems I had considered as far as government attitudes were concerned came down to the individuals in government who had the responsibilities for either developing or determining policies, whether they were in elected or appointive offices. Hence, the title of my talk—"What Price Competence?"

My thesis is that in one way or another because of the increasing importance of the Federal and State Governments in our industrial, political and personal lives, we must find ways and means to attract and hold the most competent personnel possible in every facet of our senior administrative and elective offices.

We, in business, I am sure realize that the basic reasons for the success of our company operations are not our surplus cash and securities, our sophisticated data processing equipment installations, the degree of up-to-dateness of our process equipment and structures used in operations or even our basic raw material positions. Rather our success depends on the caliber and competence of our management and supervisory personnel. I'm sure we would all agree that only through the utilization of skillful, dedicated and able people strategically located with responsibility to anticipate potential problems and authority to resolve them, can any modern day business hope to move forward.

I believe the same needs for capable and devoted people exist at all levels of our administrative and legislative branches of Federal government. Yet, we in America have either wittingly or unwittingly created a highly impractical compensation level for our public servants, an impossible expense level and an atmosphere of persecution by the columnists and others who at real sacrifice, are devoting their careers to government service.

The imbalance and inequity between management salary levels in government and those in industry are appalling. A recent issue of Business Week, for example, listed the salaries of senior officers in 119 of our leading industrial companies. Considering salaries alone, without additional compensation benefits, average annual compensation for the chief executive officers was $178,000. The combined annual gross revenues of these companies totaled $213 billion.

Now, let's compare these statistics with compensation levels in the Federal Government which in the current fiscal year will be responsible for a spending budget of over $100 billion. At the head of the list our President receives $150,000 a year of which $50,000 is earmarked for expenses. The next highest paid officer, the Vice President, receives $43,000. Cabinet officers are paid $35,000, Congressmen and Senators $30,000, Under Secretaries $28,500, Assistant Secretaries $27,000, and key positions in various departments at levels below these amounts.

Even if we relate these salaries to middle management salaries in the 119 companies I mentioned previously, where middle management salaries represent 30% to 40% of the chief executive officer, middle management salaries in these 119 companies would be substantially in excess of salary levels paid our senior government officials, with the single exception of the President of the United States.

This startling contrast can be carried further by dropping down to the State level where expenditures and responsibilities are also of a very high order. New York state, for example, pays its Governor the national top salary of $50,000 while Arkansas' Governor gets the national low of $10,000. This latter salary is not as much as many of us are paying for starting salaries of the top one-third of college graduates with MBA or PhD degrees.

A good case in point relates to the Secretary of Defense. He controls $55 billion in expenditures—receives a salary of $35,000. His executive vice president, the Under Secretary of Defense, receives $28,500.

Most of you know Secretary of the Treasury Fowler, who for many years as head of his Washington law firm, was counsel for our Association. Secretary Fowler has been in and out of Government service in key positions for the past many years at tremendous personal sacrifice. Secretary Fowler's position as second ranking cabinet member and fifth highest government official, administering one of the most complicated jobs in government, covering tax policies and money policies involving many billions of dollars, pays $35,000.

The same sentiments could be expressed regarding Secretary Connor, a former Chairman of MCA and president of Merck & Co., who has made real sacrifice in compensation and in sale of personally owned securities to serve our country as Secretary of Commerce at the munificent salary of $35,000 he now receives compared with in excess of $200,000 which he received at the time he left Merck & Co. to become a member of the Cabinet.

While some individuals such as those I have enumerated are dedicated individuals and willingly make the sacrifice entailed, by and large we cannot expect to attract talented and capable individuals to staff the multiplicity of government posts and to serve in Congress unless rewards are somewhere in line with competitive positions available in industry or in the professions.

Not only are salaries all the way through government not competitive but expense accounts in government are on the whole much more meager and benefits such as those offered outside government are not comparable.

All of the foregoing really boils down not to a question of what we can afford but rather to the conclusions that we cannot afford not to create pay incentives, work conditions and benefits that will be sufficient to attract capable talent to cope with the multiplicity of problems of big government.

The need is now! A recent study entitled "Men Near the Top" by John Corson of McKinsey & Company and Shale Paul of Research Analysis Corporation points out that there are 5,000 career men and women in the Federal Government who hold key civilian posts at the so-called "supergrade" level, just beneath the top level of political appointees. This group represents the "elite corps" working force in the management of government programs.

Over the next decade 4,000 of these key people (60% have been in government service over 20 years) will have to be replaced. Most of the 5,000 entered government service during two unique periods: (1) After the Depression when many talented and educated young people couldn't get jobs and (2) The immediate Post World War II period when veterans anxious to return to civilian life, availed themselves of the preference given them in government hiring.

Both of these periods were "buyer's markets". The situation is completely reversed today. . A "seller's market" for talent exists throughout business and pay incentives and other non-monetary incentives are so far beyond government levels there is no contest at all.

One more problem which can be "thrown into the hopper" is the limited average tenure of appointees to government positions. I remember when I was Chairman of the Committee to set up a new organization for the Department of the Army, our study revealed that over the past ten years the average tenure of Assistant Secretarys of the Army had been a little over one year and that 70% of the appointees had been attorneys. I'm sure you can imagine how much an Assistant Secretary of the Army could contribute during a tenure of one year.

I don't believe it's necessary for me to go further in highlighting the problem we face in getting capable people in government. Incompetence and bumbling of key government positions cannot only cost untold billions in wasted tax dollars but can ultimately slide us over the precipice of disaster in our economy, our world position and our way of life as we know it today.

What can we do in our small way to try to get our contemporaries, our Association, our company managements, our fellow citizens conscious of the problem and get steps started toward ultimate solution of the problem?

At this point I'd like to tell you the story about the young grade school pupil whose teacher told him to read a book on the life of Socrates and then prepare a brief review of the subject. A week later this student turned in his review which consisted of three lines:

1. Socrates was a Greek.
2. He went around giving advice to people.
3. They poisoned him.

In spite of the risk entailed in giving advice, I would like to conclude my talk by presenting some ideas for your contemplation and hopefully after contemplation for your helpful assistance by suggestion and discussion.

First—Primary in any planned improvement in compensation levels in government is the compensation level of members of Congress.

Unless this level of compensation is adjusted upward, any serious consideration for change in other government salary levels is doomed.

If the $30,000 salary level of Congressmen and Senators were doubled, these salaries would still be in a range well below compensation levels of moderate size business senior executives.

It goes without saying if salary levels of our legislators were increased we would attract better talent in many cases and with less worry about finances our legislators could do a better job.

If the salary levels of our legislators were increased, then salary levels in all senior government posts could be scaled up proportionately.

Along with increased salary levels should go increased expense allowances for normal expenditures commensurate with those allowed in comparable industrial positions.

If pay levels and expense allowances for government positions were increased, then I believe business leaders should accept the responsibility of changing their attitude toward middle management executives entering government service.

In my opinion we cannot have good management in government in the years ahead unless industry is willing to give leaves of absence, not for a year or a little more, but for a minimum of several years.

Just being willing to give leaves of absence will not be enough. Industry management must be anxious to offer incentives to those who are willing to enter government service so that on their return to their companies they will be advanced to the salary and benefit status they would have had had they stayed with the company and in addition be given a year of time as "roving centers" to catch up with what has gone on in the business during their absence.

I believe extra credit could be given in companies to those individuals willing to undertake government service something akin to the Medal of Merit of World War II.

In addition, securities owned by those entering government service should not have to be sold but legislation should be passed so those securities could be "Trusteed" and the individual not have to be penalized by capital gains tax and other penalties.

Now that I am reaching the end of my talk I'm sure some of you will thing I've been taking L.S.D., talking hopefully about what might be done but with little chance of anything being accomplished.

At least I hope I've highlighted to you the problems of competence in government in the years ahead.

In my opinion the future of our country and our position of world leadership depends on finding the solution to the problems I have highlighted.

There have been some excellent reports and recommendations on this subject. President Kennedy appointed a Panel headed by Clarence Randall which in 1963 made some thoughtful recommendations regarding compensation levels in government career and executive salaries as well as Congressional salary levels and expense allowances. However, little has been done about adopting the suggestions.

President Johnson appointed a Panel to submit recommendations on Federal salaries headed by Marion Folsom, which reported in April 1965 reiterating some of the reports of the Randall Commission but so far nothing of major import has been accomplished in bringing up the overall level of Federal executive and career salaries to a point where the average individual can afford without great personal sacrifice to enter government service.

To accomplish the goals outlined in my talk and in many previous studies by eminent Panels of outstanding authorities it is essential that the Administration once more take the necessary leadership in cooperation with leaders of industry, education, and labor to meet head on the problem of finding ways and means to assure that capable men dedicated to their country's service will be able without undue sacrifice to serve at all levels of appointive and elective offices.

The task can be accomplished—we cannot affort to fail!

The Price of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, lest we forget, I would like to include in the RECORD an article from the Johnson City, Tenn., Press-Chronicle, which quotes the American Creed adopted by the House of Representatives in 1918:

PRICE OF FREEDOM

"Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it."—Thomas Paine.

These words, spoken long ago, challenge every American today.

Freedom is not free. It comes at a price. Sometimes the price is high, as high as life itself. Our fighting forces in Viet Nam bear witness to this. Many here at home make a mockery of it by tearing up draft cards, spitting on the flag, and in general behaving in a manner that sickens decency.

Yet the nation endures, because the great majority of its people still subscribe to the American's Creed adopted by the House of Representatives in 1918. It goes like this:

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic, a sovereign nation of many sovereign states; a perfect union one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes. I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

Let's Wave the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent Fourth of July commemoration produced pertinent and proper editorial comment.

Typical of the comments are three items placed in the RECORD at this point, which appeared in weekly newspapers from the Fourth Congressional District of Illinois.

The Palos Regional, Palos Heights, Ill., carried comments writen by Sidney L. DeLove. The Lansing Journal had a prominent front page editorial by its editor, Tom Inkley. The Calumet Index carried a poem by Lee Sobanski.

The material follows:

[From the Palos Heights (Ill.) Regional]

LET'S WAVE THE FLAG

Is it possible to wave the flag too much? Provided, of course, that you wave it with integrity? Is it possible to study Lincoln or Shakespeare too much? Is it possible to read the Bible too much? The great, the good, the true, are inexhaustible for inspiration, example and strength. I believe that we are not waving our flag enough, not nearly enough. It seems to me that we are developing a tendency to be timid or oven apologetic about waving the stars and stripes. Walk up and down the streets on July 4th and count the flags. It is our nation's birthday, a sacred day in world history, the most important day of America. Why isn't the flag flying on every rooftop and from every home and building? This complacent attitude is strong evidence of cancerous patriotic decay.

The flag is a symbol of our national unity. It is the spirit of our undying devotion to our country. It stands for a the best that is in us . . . for loyalty, character, and faith in democracy. Isn't our flag a synonym of the United States of America? Does it not represent man's greatest, noblest, most sublime dream? Is it not the zenith of achievement, the goal to which generations have aspired? Ladies and gentlemen, I believe it is time for us . . . for the mad, rushing Twentieth Century American . . . to stop for a moment and think. Let us arrest our near reverential admiration of material success and return to the spiritual and ethical values. Let us imbue and rekindle in ourselves and our children the so-called old-fashioned way of patriotism, a burning devotion to the principles and ideals upon which our country was founded. Should not every home own and proudly display the colors on holidays and other such occasions? Isn't the flag Patrick Henry, Jefferson, Franklin, Washington, Nathan Hale, Gettysburg and Valley Forge, Paul Revere, Jackson and other great men and women who have given us our heritage. When you look at the flag can't you see the Alamo, Corregidor, Pearl Harbor, The Monitor, The Merrimac, Wake Island, and Korea?

Lest we forget, isn't the flag Flanders Field, Bataan, Iwo Jima, Normandy, Babe Ruth and Davy Crockett? The great events of our past and present are wrapped up in our flag. It is a symbol of this blessed nation, a giant in industry, education and commerce. Millions of fertile square miles, wheatland, coal mines, steel plants. Our great republic, the chosen infant destined to be man's last and remaining hope for suffering humanity, a shining beacon of light, noble and glorious, the haven for the oppressed and persecuted and truly God's gift to mankind. That is what the flag means to me.

Can we wave it too much? I don't think so.

[From the Lansing (Ill.) Journal, June 30, 1966]

Independence Day Bells Ring in Area

(By Tom Inkley)

This year there will be many four year old Americans ringing bells on July Fourth, who will grow up believing that this was always the custom.

Actually it was, from the first Independence Day till about a century ago when the sounds of peace were drowned out by the noise of war, and the day became celebrated only with firecrackers and rockets.

Writing in a book called "The Seasons of America Past" a few years ago, the author unearthed the story about Independence Day bell-ringing, and he mentioned that "it seems with firecrackers disappearing we might well revive that early American custom."

The idea quickly took hold and supported by organizations and churches and newspapers it reached millions of people.

In 1963 it was passed Washington as Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, requesting that all American bells, public and private, church, school, fire, college and town bells ring simultaneously at 1 p.m. on July Fourth.

Some places now ring bells for two minutes, along with many radio, TV programs, and even public loudspeakers in parks, racetracks, ball games and on ships at sea.

For the past three years the "Bells on Independence" project has been included in governor's Fourth of July proclamations, and this holiday which was losing much of its solemn significance, was rekindled into a day of bells ringing out America's birthday, just as it was in the beginning.

It has been said that a thing must be done four times before it becomes a habit, so this fourth year, for the revival of the early American custom of ringing bells on Independence Day, is a most important one.

Perhaps there will be great bells within reach of your hearing, perhaps you will seem to be the only one ringing a small handbell; but you will know that all over the nation in every state, millions of bells will be ringing out the mesage of democracy and liberty.

A safer and less noisy pastime for children, let them ring bells on this day, proclaiming it America's birthday.

And wherever we are, let us remember this greatest of American days with joy and reverence.

The bell ringing observance in Calumet City was undertaken this year as a special project of the Calumet City Jaycees.

One of the area churches joining in the nationwide program this Fourth of July is Our Saviour's Lutheran church in Lansing.

Speaking on behalf of the church, the pastor, the Rev. Richard Horst told the Journal, "We are highly privileged to participate in this national 'Bells of Peace' observance. We feel sure that the ringing of every bell in the land simultaneously with the bells at Independence Hall will symbolize our desire for peace and liberty in a way that will be understood by the freedom loving people of the world."

The ringing of bells and carillons will coincide with the ringing of the bells at Independence Hall in Philadelphia. The observance was originated by the late President Kennedy.

A carillon is installed each year at Independence Hall, where it is used to simulate the tone of the original Liberty Bell during the observance ceremonies. The Liberty Bell has been stilled permanently to prevent its further deterioration.

There is probably no better way to sum up the importance of the Fourth of July than in the words penned by William Tyler Page back in 1916 in his "America's Creed":

"I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign states; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and their fortunes.

"I, therefore, believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to obey its laws; to respect its Flag; to support its Constitution; and to defend it against all enemies."

[From the Calumet (Ill.) Index, July 3, 1966]

Happy Birthday U.S.A.

(By Lee Sobanski, West Pullman)

Justice called men to a challenge
'Gainst a tax from 'cross the sea,
Urged men on to give their live gay
To become the subjects free.

Lexington became the marble
Where men carved the thoughts of free,
Yorktown proved their rights to pen it
'Pon this land with blood as fee.

Forward, onward, was the order
Death to those who disagree,
Of man's right to represent him
'Fore some ruler's harsh decree.

Ultimate became the prayer
And men fingered decades few,
Rights for man was then the subject
For the Good Lord to review.

The Good Lord review each item,
Paused—then worded this decree:
Heaven bless this newborn nation,
Spread its Freedom—sea to sea.

William O. Wooldridge Named Sergeant Major of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, at 11 a.m., on July 11, William O. Wooldridge, of Brownwood, Tex., was sworn in as the sergeant major of the Army at a ceremony outside the mall entrance of the Pentagon. Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Harold K. Johnson, selected Wooldridge from among 4,700 senior noncommissioned officers in the Army to be the first to occupy the recently created position of sergeant major of the Army.

A much-decorated veteran, this soldier has been awarded the Silver Star with the Oak Leaf Cluster, Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, Bronze Star Medal, Air Medal with five Oak Leaf Clusters, Army Commendation Ribbon with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Purple Heart, and the Combat Infantryman Badge with star—second award.

This new title awarded to this distinguished soldier is unprecedented in Army history. The selection was made from nominations by major Army commanders throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to share with the people of Brownwood, Tex., with his family, and with all Americans, great pride in this outstanding achievement that has been accorded to Sergeant Major Wooldridge. It is richly deserved.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a release from the Department of the Army containing Sergeant Major Wooldridge's record, and also an article which appeared on the front page of the Washington Evening Star, July 11.

The two items follow:

Sergeant Major of the Army William O. Wooldridge

Sergeant Major of the Army William O. Wooldridge was born in Shawnee, Okla., on 12 August 1922. He moved with his family to Brownwood, Tex. when he was three years old, where he attended elementary and high school.

He enlisted in the Army at Fort Sam Houston, Texas on 13 November 1940, serving initially with Company F, 23rd Regiment of the 2d Infantry Division. In December 1941 he was assigned to Company E, 10th Regiment, 5th Infantry Division and stationed in Iceland.

Sergeant Major Wooldridge was assigned to the 1st Infantry Division in 1944 and landed at Normandy on D-Day as a squad leader (sergeant). He was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action at Aachen, Germany in October, 1944. He received a second award of the Silver Star during the Battle of the Bulge in December 1944 while serving as platoon sergeant (staff sergeant).

Upon returning to the United States in May, 1945, Wooldridge was assigned at Fort Sam Houston where he remained until December 1946. He next served a brief tour with Post Headquarters at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii. He went to Japan in January

1947 where he served with Headquarters Eighth Army until September, 1948.

Sergeant Major Wooldridge was again assigned to the 1st Infantry Division in July 1949 as First Sergeant, Company K, 26th Infantry Regiment then stationed in Germany. Upon returning to the United States in May, 1954, he was assigned as First Sergeant of Company G, 3rd Infantry, Fort McNair, Washington, D.C.

Sergeant Major Wooldridge returned to the "Big Red One" as First Sergeant, Company D, 26th Infantry at Fort Riley, Kansas in December 1955. He was appointed Sergeant Major of the 3rd Battalion, 26th Infantry on 20 December 1956.

He went to Germany as Sergeant Major of 2d Battle Group, 26th Infantry, 24th Infantry Division in December 1958. He became the Division Sergeant Major in March 1963.

Sergeant Major Wooldridge returned once again to the 1st Infantry Division as Sergeant Major of the 1st Brigade in January 1965. He was appointed Division Sergeant Major in August 1965. He went to Vietnam with the "Big Red One" the following month.

Sergeant Major Wooldridge was appointed Sergeant Major of the Army on 11 July 1966, the first noncommissioned officer to hold the position.

PERSONAL DATA

Date and Place of Birth—12 August 1922, Shawnee, Oklahoma.

Parents—Father: William R. Wooldridge, Brownwood, Texas; Mother: Arminta (Gray) Wooldridge (deceased), Norman, Oklahoma.

Marriage—Date: 3 December 1945. Wife: Barbara (Gentry) Wooldridge (formerly of Lawrenceburg, Tenn.).

Children—William R. (son), age 18; Gentry (Terry) (son), age 17; Sue (daughter), age 14; John (son), age 11; and Mike (son), age 9.

DECORATIONS

Silver Star with 1st Oak Leaf Cluster.

Legion of Merit with 1st Oak Leaf Cluster.

Bronze Star Medal.

Air Medal with five Oak Leaf Clusters.

Army Commendation Ribbon with two Oak Leaf Clusters.

Purple Heart.

Combat Infantryman Badge with Star (1st and 2d awards).

Ceremony Gives Soldier New Top Noncom Rank

William O. Wooldridge, a soldier whose sole ambition 25 years ago was to be a good private, became today after three wars the first sergeant major of the Army.

In his new rank, established by General Order 29, July 4, Wooldridge, holder of 2 Silver Stars from action in Europe in World War II, became the highest ranking enlisted man in the Army. He will serve as an adviser to Gen. Harold K. Johnson, chief of staff.

Wooldridge, who was sworn in at ceremonies on the parade field at the Pentagon, was selected as top soldier from among 47,000 senior noncommissioned officers of the Army.

Sgt. Maj. Wooldridge's new ensignia was pinned on by Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the joint chiefs of staff. Looking on were Wooldridge's wife, Barbara, and four sons and one daughter.

When told in Viet Nam recently of his promotion, Wooldridge commented "I feel like I've just been kicked out of home. It's a great honor but I'll miss the division, I'll really miss this outfit." Wooldridge was then serving as sergeant major of the 1st Infantry Division.

"Twenty-five years ago I came into the Army hoping to be a good private," he recalled.

Wooldridge joined the Army in 1940 and was assigned to the 1st Infantry Division, then at Ft. Sam Houston, Tex. He served in all of the division's eight European campaigns from North Africa through Germany.

In 1944 he suffered a face wound from tank fire during the battle of Aachen. After returning to the United States in 1945 he was sent to Japan for two years, then it was back to Europe and once more to the 1st Division.

Wooldridge went to Viet Nam with the division's advance party last September. He was due to rotate back to the United States in July but extended for six months to remain with the division. He made a brief visit to the United States last December as the division's representative when Birmingham, Ala., adopted the 1st Division.

The 43-year-old sergeant major is a native of Shawnee, Okla. He was recommended for his present post by Maj. Gen. William Dupuy, commanding general of the division.

The new title, unprecedented in Army history, places an enlisted man on the staff of the Army's chief of staff to advise on problems affecting enlisted personnel, the education and advancement of noncommissioned officers and on morale, training, pay and promotions. His job, in brief, is to present the enlisted man's viewpoint to the Army's staff chief.

Hudson Honors Firemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Hudson, Mass., in my district on June 12 honored the deceased members of its dedicated fire department in memorial services, in which I was honored and privileged to participate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of my remarks at this simple, but impressive community exercise.

The material follows:

Remarks in Part of Congressman Philip J. Philbin Memorial Services for Deceased Firemen, Hudson, Mass., June 12, 1966

This community, indeed all our communities can be thankful that we have had the steadfast, effective services of these men of both past and present generations. These men, like the men of our police forces, are called upon in the performance of their duties to be ready at a moment's notice to risk their lives for the sake of community security.

In that sense, they are like members of the armed services and must respond instantaneously and oft-times at great risk to protect private and public property from destruction, and to prevent powerful conflagrations that would cause widespread damage and waste of valuable economic resources and even loss of life.

In the course of their daily work, these brave men, whom we so fittingly honor today, have not only unselfishly protected the public safety and private property, they have performed countless other services having to do with local well-being, the saving of life and the promotion of worthy civic causes. They have never lost an opportunity to take an interest and to play a part in activities that help and benefit the people as a whole of every age, class and group.

I commend and congratulate those of you of this very efficient Fire Department, your leaders and comrades throughout the state and nation for arranging suitable exercises to acknowledge the tremendous public contribution that has been made by your departed comrades.

This thoughtful, well-arranged program gives all of us a chance to join collectively today in paying heartfelt tribute to all those of your Fire Department who have served so devotedly throughout the years in the very best traditions of our American way of life for the protection, the security, the well-being and welfare of every man, woman and child in this community.

As we turn our hearts and minds today on this touching occasion, to the deeds, the sacrifices and the outstanding fidelity to duty of these men, let us give public expression to our grateful appreciation for what they have done during their lives, and during their faithful service to this beautiful community, to uphold our very best standards of public service.

The example of their complete devotion to their vital work will long be remembered. The memory of their many brave deeds will long be acknowledged. The fond recollections of their staunch, loyal, friendship, fine citizenship and whole-hearted service will long be recalled in our prayers and in our thoughts by a truly grateful people.

How fortunate we are these days that their capable successors are following in their footsteps, as you here assembled are doing, inspired by their legacy of devotion and loyalty to carry on in the spirit, in the faith and in the superb dedication to the public interest that they exemplified and is needed so much in these days of crisis, to guard and strengthen our community life and sustain and guard the great free system of which we are so proud and which we are determined to preserve and enrich.

May these cherished comrades of yours find rest and peace in their heavenly home.

And may you, their proud successors, long carry on their great work for community, state and nation.

Vice President Pays Tribute to Rev. Richard E. Evans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to submit for the Record a letter from Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey in tribute to the late Reverend Dr. Richard E. Evans of the old Labor Temple, formerly located at East 14th Street and Second Avenue in New York City, which is part of my congressional district.

Vice President Humphrey's letter has been laminated and has been affixed in a place of honor in the Reverend Richard E. Evans Interfaith Meditation Room of the J.F.K. Library for Minorities, Inc., which is dedicated to the Nation's immigrants in the spirit of the book "A Nation of Immigrants," written by the late President John F. Kennedy.

The letter follows:

The Vice President,
Washington, May 25, 1966.

Mr. J. P. Sommer,
Director, J.F.K. Library for Minorities, Inc.,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Sommer: Please convey my greetings and congratulations on the dedication of the Reverend Richard E. Evans Interfaith Meditation Room. Its location is so very appropriate in the Library for Minorities which bears the immortal name of our late, beloved President John F. Kennedy. Dick Evans would have been so pleased to be remembered in this meaningful manner—which serves the cause of God and of human brotherhood. As Dick Evans' friend, as one who admired his humility, his spiritual dedication, his devotion to the Family of Man and to the cause of liberty and good will, I join with his many other friends and admirers in commending this fine occasion.

One of the greatest success stories in all the world consists of the contributions to our nation by immigrants of every background, every race, creed and color. By giving the foreign-born the opportunity to rise individually to their highest potential, America has enriched itself beyond measure—in intangibles as well as tangibly.

It is a fact—all to unfortunately, that at times in our history, America has not been fully true to its own ideals. There have been unhappy times of bigotry and intolerance. The door of discrimination has often been slammed in the face of many innocent people—native or foreign-born—merely because of the color of their skin, the temple of their worship, the land of their of their father's birth. Fortunately, our nation has turned the corner. Most of these regrettable situations have now been changed for the better. More corrective action is still to be taken. As you pause for prayer in this Interfaith Meditation Room may you—may all of us—take renewed strength from Dick Evans' great values. May you—may all of us—proceed to fulfill the highest principles of our respective faiths. By putting our creed into our daily deed, we will demonstrate our true devotion to the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. We will thus carry on in Dick Evans' inspiring memory.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

The American Farmer—God Bless Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when millions of the world's inhabitants are plagued with famine, I believe we should acknowledge those responsible for the abundance of food with which we have been blessed.

The people of our country are too often so enamored with the great food supply available, they take this abundance for granted. But more importantly, the man responsible for this abundance has been obscured by decorative wrappings and labels embracing the products of his toil. I am speaking of the American farmer.

If we stop to envision the various roles performed by the typical American farmer, we can see not only an American clothed in the simple garb of his trade, but a soldier in uniform fighting a global war against hunger and starvation, a world trader selling his goods to foreign lands and bringing precious gold home to America, and a diplomat who speaks the only international language—the language of contentment. The American farmer does all this and more.

A recent article in the Plainsman, a Nebraska-based publication serving the Midlands States, clearly and succinctly pointed out this fact.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I place the entire article from the July-August, 1966 issue of the Plainsman at this point in the RECORD:

THE AMERICAN FARMER—GOD BLESS HIM

Every American, whether city-dweller or small-town merchant, has a vital stake in a strong, aggressive United States agriculture—an interest that strikes far beyond the incredible quality and variety of food products that daily are set before him.

The American farmer, in fact, has become a significant force in the struggle to solve one of this nation's most difficult economic problems, to wit, the deficit in our international balance of payments.

The farmer has become a salesman—a global salesman. And in just the last seven years, he has played an increasingly vital role in preserving the integrity of the dollar. Consider these facts, presented at a conference on agricultural export trade held recently in Minneapolis.

Item: Agricultural exports now represent about one-fourth—repeat, ONE-FOURTH—of all United States merchandise moving into export.

Item: Total farm exports in this fiscal year are expected to hit a record $6.7 billion—more than double the figure of only seven years ago, and exceeding by at least $500 million the export records set in each of the previous two years.

Item: Farm exports for cash (as opposed to concessional, under Government programs) will approach $5 billion in the current fiscal year—compared with $2.5 billion just seven years ago.

A CLEAR PICTURE

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, in a speech before the Minneapolis conference, provided an even clearer picture of what all this means.

And whether he understood it or not, every American obviously would have been affected by a weakening of the dollar on the international level, which could have resulted had it not been for the enormous contributions of our agriculture.

But more important than this, the tremendous productive capacity of American agriculture serves as a keystone for a solution to an even more serious problem—and with far more awesome consequences.

World population is fast outpacing its ability to produce food. If this trend is permitted to continue, or so the experts have predicted, the result could mean widespread global famine within 20 years.

Any resulting global conflict to control the world's food resources, as one Government official stated it, "Would make Viet Nam look like a neighborhood squabble."

But the United States and other nations are attempting to reverse the trend—to expand the capacity of the under-developed nations to become more self-sufficient in their production of food.

And, as Secretary Freeman commented in his Minneapolis speech, "The American farmer holds the key to whether there will be time enough to avoid disaster. A large measure of hope for peace in the world depends upon his ability to furnish food for restless, hungry people—to buy time while scientists and agricultural technicians of our own country and other advanced nations teach the less-developed regions to produce more for their own needs."

A VITAL STAKE

Need we repeat that every American has a vital stake in agriculture?

In the first nine months of the 1965-66 fiscal year, Secretary Freeman said, our agricultural trade balance is up 10 per cent over the same period a year earlier. The balance of farm exports over farm imports amounted to some $1.7 billion, compared with about $1.5 billion a year earlier.

But at the same time, he noted, the nonagricultural trade balance was DOWN 25 per cent. The balance of non-farm exports over non-farm imports was $2.3 billion, compared with $3.1 billion the year before. On the same program, Secretary Freeman's Director of Agricultural Economics, Nathan M. Koffsky, put it more bluntly:

"To my mind," he said, "there has not been an appropriate recognition of the important contributions that agricultural exports make to our balance of payments."

If farm exports had not risen as they did in the past seven year, Mr. Koffsky added, "the deficit in our balance of payments last year would have been twice as big as it was. And the threat to our economic stability would have been that much greater."

What would this have meant to the layman, to the non-economist who doesn't think in such terms as "the integrity of the dollar"? It almost certainly would have meant much more stringent controls on the flow of dollars out of the country.

SEVERE RESTRICTIONS

To the fertilizer dealer from Keokuk, Ia., it might have meant more severe restrictions—or even a total embargo—on the liquor he wants to bring back with him from a trip to Canada.

The same restrictions might have been applied to the school teacher from Tennessee who bought some Irish linen on a vacation trip to Europe—if her trip had been allowed at all.

And to the businessman who thinks big—who has expanded his operations abroad—the "persuasion" now employed by the Government to limit his overseas investments might have acquired some formidable teeth.

Wagons Ho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, through the ingenuity and foresight of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Hefner of Quinter, Kans., in my congressional district, anyone with the spirit of adventure may taste the experiences of the hardy pioneers who endured untold hardships in opening up the West.

Mr. and Mrs. Hefner are the sponsors of a unique recreation project, "Wagons Ho," which features covered wagons, saddle horses, campfires, and even an Indian raid. Caravans begin at Castle Rock, a point on the historic Butterfield Trail over which wagon trains and stages traveled, and along which vast herds of Texas longhorns were driven before the turn of the century. "Wagons Ho" traverses portions of the trail where at certain points the wagon ruts are still discernible.

After several days of living under the stars, present-day "pioneers" are returned to the point of origin, much richer for the experience, and with some idea of the hazards to which early day settlers were subjected.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to the article, "Wagons on the Prairie," appearing in the July 1966 issue of Soil

Conservation, a U.S. Department of Agriculture publication. The article, which follows, features the Hefners and is written by Jack W. Walstrom of the Salina, Kans., SCS office, and Howard V. Cheney, Gove County work unit conservationist:

WAGONS ON THE PRAIRIE: KANSAS FARM COUPLE REVIVE OLD BUTTERFIELD WAGON-TRAIN DAYS FOR RECREATION PROFIT

The cry of "Wagons Ho" once again echoes across the western Kansas plains as covered wagons move out along the old Butterfield Trail.

"Wagons Ho" is a new income-producing recreation project for Frank and Ruth Hefner of Quinter, Kans.

ON THE TRAIL

Guests of the Hefners spend several days and nights on the trail, enjoying many varied activities and the quiet beauty of the Kansas prairie.

Potential pioneers usually arrive at a selected campsite the evening before the trip begins. They get to know one another, and the Hefners explain the activities to come. The next morning, it's "Wagons Ho!" And the wagon train starts its journey down the Butterfield Trail.

A typical day's schedule: Eating a hearty breakfast on the open prairie; riding in a covered wagon, Concord stage, or on a saddle horse; fording a shallow section of the Smoky Hill River; searching for fossils or rocks in prime hunting areas; viewing occasional cattle herds; being entertained around an evening campfire; and resting beneath a western sky. And somewhere along the way an Indian raid and a visit by a Pony Express rider are sure things.

Good food, and plenty of it, are of course a vital part of the Hefners' western hospitality.

The Hefners, cooperators with the Gove County Soil Conservation District, completed a Great Plains Conservation Program contract on their 2,560-acre farm in 1964. Under the plan, 230,000 feet of terraces and 2 acres of windbreaks were installed, and 83 acres of cropland was converted to grass. With the major conservation work done, they turned their attention to recreation.

An interesting aspect of this 20th Century wagon train is the cooperation the Hefners receive from the many people involved.

Howard Cheney, SCS work unit conservationist, helped determine the original route of the Butterfield Trail, still visible on aerial photographs. He made a list of landowners whose permission would be needed to cross their lands.

Fifty-five landowners and tenants gave the Hefners permission not only to cross their lands but also to use likely areas for campsites and stopping places. Many landowners have become so enthusiastic that they pitch in and help, providing skilled wagon drivers and horsemen for the tour.

The wagon train includes 13 covered wagons, 25 horses and mules, and a stagecoach. The stagecoach, built from the original plans of the Concord Coach Company, has no springs. Concord used strips of leather to cradle the body and absorb bumps. The stagecoach wheels also are authentic, made specially in Arkansas by Mennonite craftsmen. Passengers trade places at each rest stop so that everyone has an opportunity to ride in the Butterfield coach.

As the caravan moves along, drivers and cowboys point out scenes of interest—a homesteader's long-abandoned sod house; the ruts of the Texas cattle trail trampled into the sod by millions of longhorns in the 1870's; and the original stage stations along the Butterfield Trail. Also of interest to the Easterner and all city folk are some of the signs of modern farming—fields reseeded to grass, terraces, and trench silos.

AT DAY'S END

After a day that passes all too soon, the wagon train forms a circle at the predetermined prairie campsite. Not far away, behind a grove of trees, is a ranch house that offers a chance for travelers to take a refreshing shower and wash the trail dust off their faces. They do not tarry long, however, because the campfires are lit, and the aroma of food soon fills the air.

Before the last rays of the sun disappear, all hands prepare their sleeping bags. The bags are furnished at the journey's start to make a more comfortable bed under the stars or upon native hay piled high in the wagons. The dark outline of the wagons against the dimly lit western horizon, the smell of campfire smoke, and the sound of whinnying horses truly bring the old West back to life.

At night, the modern pioneers gather around a campfire and blackened coffeepot to hear western music from guitar and fiddle. Those who want to can dance to their favorite western and polka tunes on the buffalo sod. Others listen to the wagonmaster spin tales of cowboys who camped nearby while driving huge longhorn herds to the northern railroads.

AND THEN THE MAIL

One of the trip's exciting moments comes when a Pony Express rider delivers to each traveler a letter from Wagons Ho. The letter is an invitation to attend a reunion each fall with other Wagons Ho guests. Tourists from the United States, South America, Germany, England, Ireland, and Sweden have already enjoyed Wagons Ho hospitality.

Harry Morris, an airline executive from Middlesex, England, wrote the Hefners, "Our time with Wagons Ho was the most exciting of our trip in the United States. You are to be commended for keeping the heritage of the West alive, for this part of America is known and loved the world over."

Wagons Ho has made 13 trips across Kansas prairie since its beginning 2 years ago. The Hefners so far have come out about even financially, but they expect to realize a small profit this year.

With satisfied guests urging their friends to travel wagon train, the old Butterfield Trail is once again taking more and more "pioneers" west.

The Draft Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much discussion has been promised on the draft question, but related issues deserve equal commentary. I insert, for the RECORD, the editorial of radio station WIND in Chicago, given on July 5, and a column by Editor Fred C. Lilley, of the Oak Lawn News, which I believe observe attention:

[From WIND Radio, July 5, 1966]

THE LEGAL AGE

(By Edward Wallis, general manager)

The long Independence Day week-end holiday gave a lot of people a lot of time to relax and to think. We were thinking, as we hope you were, about our independence; about those who fought for it and those who drafted the Declaration and the principles which it set forth a hundred and ninety years ago. Then we started thinking about the youth of our country . . . those particularly between eighteen and twenty-five, who make up the principal age group serving in our armed forces. What brought it to mind was a letter we had from a listener, whose son enlisted at age seventeen in 1964. Out of his two years, he has served one manning a machine gun post in a helicopter in Viet Nam.

He is now back in the States, but is based outside of Illinois. He owns a 1956 automobile, which is registered in Illinois and insured in Illinois, but because of his age, it is in his parents' name. In order for him to use his car at his out-of-state base, he would have to purchase the State's license plates, as well as be subject to higher premiums for his car insurance as the principal driver of the car, plus the costs of transfer and title.

We recognize the complexity that such situations create for State licensing and for insuring, but we submit that no matter how difficult making exceptions may be, that young men particularly under the age of twenty-one who are serving in our Armed Services, especially those who have served in active duty, have responded to the highest call of their country . . . to risk their lives. In our estimation, they have met the greatest test . . . they are men . . . and, if they are men on a battlefield, then they should be accorded that same status when they return home.

In discussing the same subject with a well-known Chicago attorney, he cited numerous other areas involving the rights of those under the legal age, which perhaps need examination. A young man may be subject to the draft or compulsory military training at the age of eighteen . . . but he cannot vote; he cannot sign a legal document; he or his parents must pay premium payments for auto insurance until he is age twenty-five; in essence, he has no legal status. We suggest that this is inequitable for those who have served in active duty and, we believe that government, as well as business, should make provisions to compensate for it.

[From the Oak Lawn News, June 30, 1966]

AS I SEE IT

(By Fred C. Lilley)

War is hell and I hate it as I have said many times in these articles. "Police actions" or undeclared wars are even worse since there is no clearly defined motive for our boys to be fighting and dying in these actions. If you will remember, those of you who can, the country's reaction to World War 1. After many incidents, culminated by the sinking of an American ship, the country was quite prepared to go to war in every sense of the word. We were fired up with enthusiasm to raise money and armies to any degree necessary to not only fight to win this unwanted but seemingly necessary war. Then look at World War II. Here again a dastardly incident of direct action against the United States stirred the people to the necessary heights so that making the necessary effort was automatic. The Korean War lacked that spark which is necessary to really instill patriotic fervor in the populace. However, the action of the North Koreans was so sudden and dramatic that it did capture some of the imagination of people who were convinced that the South Koreans were being over run. But in the latest of the undeclared Wars, the Viet Nam conflict, we have no such drama. There is fighting which has been going on for many, many years prior to our involvement. The French were thrown out ignominiously and why we thought we would fare better is a mystery.

Is it any wonder then why young men are burning draft cards and using various means of subterfuge to avoid the draft? True, they are in a very small minority, for which we thank God, but nevertheless it is unfortunate that any segment of our society should feel this way. And, it is to such groups that the fringe of unscrupulous, un-American hangers-on attach themselves. It does not take a large force of well trained, Un-American individuals, indoctrinated with some foreign ideology to transform a rabble of individuals into an active violent mob. Thus, we project an image to the werld of a dissatisfied people, which on the whole is not true. Certainly, many of us do not agree with many things going on in Washington but we will attempt to use our ballot to change matters rather than the violence in the streets.

Now, we are having hearings in Washington regarding the draft. I believe and have so stated previously that the draft was a war time measure and should be abolished. However, if we must have it let us at least administer it constructively. For example, why should a young man wait around until 24 or older before he is called. In the interim he cannot secure a cereer job since companies know he is subject to the draft. Why not induct each youth at age 18 or upon graduation after that birth date. He would spend one year in the Armed Forces during which time he would undergo fair and impartial screening and testing for aptitudes and College potential. Then, if he shows such potential he would be released to go to College at his own expense if possible or at Government expense if necessary. Others would be screened out or into other areas of service for their country. The salary scale would be raised materially for military service to encourage those qualified to make such service a career. I believe through these efforts we would solve the problems of our youth and maintain an adequate fighting force composed of men who are there because they want to be. What do you think?

Tight Money—Remedial Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, presently, the economy of the Nation is faced with the growing scarcity of bank credit. Commercial banks cannot supply the present credit demands. Today, credit at the Federal Reserve is available at the discount rate of 4½ percent but only on eligible assets and then only for 15 days. These eligible assets are Treasury securities and certain short-term paper. Other assets like customers' loans and other obligations are eligible, but at a penalty rate of an additional one-half of 1 percent and also for 15 days. This penalty and this limitation of time are the rub. In today's economy, these are costly burdens and are contributing to tigher money. These restraints and limitations should be removed if commercial banks are to serve adequately business and industry generally.

Banks are competing one with another for funds in all markets in all sections of the country. When banks thus compete with each other, no new credit is established to meet growing demands. They are hampered by their ineligibility to borrow readily and economically from the 12 Federal Reserve banks which comprise the country's central banking system.

The outmoded and obsolete borrowing restrictions are intensifying present difficulties. The Federal Reserve has recognized a need for change and has recommended legislation. There is a bill pending in the House, which has already passed the Senate last August. It is S. 1559. It is presently lodged in the House Banking and Currency Committee. The proposed bill would permit a member bank to borrow from a Federal Reserve bank on the security of any assets acceptable to the Reserve Bank without paying a penalty rate of interest. The 15-day limitation would be removed.

William McC. Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, has stated:

> As long as member banks hold a large enough volume of Government securities, they need not, of course, be particularly concerned as to the eligibility for discount with the Reserve banks of customers' paper held by them. Since World War II, however, there has been a sharp net decline in the aggregate holdings of Government securities by member banks. If a continuing substantial increase in economic activity should cause banks further to reduce their holdings of Government securities in order to meet increased credit demands, many banks would be obliged to tender other kinds of collateral if they should seek to obtain Federal Reserve credit.

In order to avoid cumbersome administrative procedures and problems arising from the necessity of distinguishing between "eligible" and "ineligible" paper, the Reserve Board urged Congress to move in and revise and update the law so as to eliminate the existing restrictions with respect to "eligible" paper.

The administration approves of this new procedure.

This legislation would remove technical impediments to ready access to Federal Reserve credit without penalty. The Federal Reserve Board wants to make the discount window an effective means of supplying funds to commercial banks.

Enactment of this measure would benefit all banks—large and small—in all sections of the country. It would relieve the pressure and reduce destructive competition for funds among banks and between banks and nonbank financial institutions.

Clinton Memorial Day Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 30 this year, I was privileged to participate in the stirring and impressive Memorial Day exercises in my own hometown of Clinton, Mass., and under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the news account of this event which appeared in the Clinton, Mass. Item.

The material follows:

MEMORIAL DAY RITES OBSERVED IN CLINTON

"Memorial Day is a great, nationwide, spontaneous outpouring of tribute, honor, gratitude and remembrance of the gallant and the great, of those in every American generation who thought so much of American freedom and the American way of life that they willingly laid down their lives."

So said Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, in his Memorial Day address in Central Park Monday while hundreds of Clintonians participated in the annual ceremonies there to honor their dead loved ones.

In both Woodlawn and St. John's cemeteries, graves were decorated and prayers were said as taps were sounded and the National Guard firing squad saluted deceased veterans from all past wars.

Three bands and the Joanette Drill Team from Leominister highlighted the musical portions of the parade and marchers included the Veterans units, their auxiliaries, Gold Star mothers, Boy and Girl Scouts, Cubs and Brownies.

Parade marshal was Lt. Col. William M. Duncanson U.S. Army Ret., assisted by Gerald Ruberti, Francis M. Ponyta and Donald McGuirk. Prayers were read by the Rev. Richard L. Harding of the First Baptist Church, Miss Nancy L. Anderson (highest honor pupil at CHS) delivered the Gettysburg Address, and John Bandalewicz Commander of the Polish American War Veterans from Maynard read the general orders.

The musical units were: The Clinton High School Band, the Clinton Junior High Band and the Shirley P.A.L. Band.

ALL AMERICANS

The Congressman's remarks follow in part:

"Memorial Day has deepest significance to us and to all Americans. The day was first officially established following our Civil War and many gallant young men of Clinton served and fought in that bloody conflict to establish national and civil rights.

"Most of the bitterness of that fratricidal conflict has disappeared, but the memory of these gallant heroes remains, and their devotion to country is permanently enshrined in the hearts of our people and inscribed upon permanent monuments in our beautiful park, side by side with fitting memorials to the gallant service and sacrifice of those who fought and died in the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II and veterans of other Americans wars.

"While Memorial Day came into being to commemorate the brave veterans of the Civil War, it has thus been extended to pay fitting tribute to all those who have given of themselves, who have made the supreme sacrifice, or who have served faithfully and heroically to uphold American liberty and justice."

OUTPOURING OF TRIBUTE

"Today, Memorial Day is a great, nationwide, spontaneous outpouring of tribute, honor, gratitude and remembrance of the gallant and the great, of those in every American generation who thought so much of American freedom and the American way of life that they willingly laid down their lives, or offered their lives, most of them in the flower of their youth, in order that this great government dedicated to human freedom might survive, grow, prosper and become, as it has become, the greatest nation in world history.

"No honor we could confer upon them would be enough to express our thanks, and the thanks of the country, to these valiant veterans for what they have done to protect, preserve and save this great nation, its homes, its freedoms, its vaunted institutions of enterprise and justice.

"No monument, no plaque, no words can measure their noble sacrifices. They rest in honored glory. They are enshrined in grateful American hearts with eternal love, devotion and gratitude.

"On this day of devout remembrance, dedicated to them, this day of prayer, of fond recollection for departed loved ones, let us once again, as we have done for so many years, throughout the grand history of our beloved citadel of liberty, turn our hearts and our prayers to them with tender, enduring thoughts of appreciation deeply harbored in the heart of every American."

GREAT HEROES

"Hail to these great heroes, hail to these men, and these women too, of revered and honored memory, who have bequeathed to us such a precious, noble legacy of true Americanism, and who have consecrated with their blood, their sacrifices and their love, the shrines of this great country and the exalted purposes for which it exists.

"Their sacrifices have not been, and will not be, in vain. They will live forever in the hearts and minds of true Americans. These heroes will be revered and they will be emulated, as they have been throughout our history, to the end of time, and as long as men and women strive, struggle and sacrifice to be free from oppression.

"This day, and these days of struggle, turmoil and strife serve to remind us of the price that a great free people are always willing to pay to defend and preserve their liberties.

"Today, our honored dead, resting in their eternal, heavenly bivouac, speak to us again in the voice of freedom, in the example of their spirit of sacrifice and loyalty, more eloquently than words, and more nobly than we can describe."

BURDEN OF CALL

"It is for us today, as it always has been for real Americans, to take up the burden of their call, to give living expression to the memory and example of their sacrifice, to carry out the inspiration they have given us to defend our blessed free country and the priceless liberties that have made it great against those who seek our destruction, and who strive to turn this free nation and the free world into a fiery shambles of conflict and tyranny.

"With prayerful tribute and flowers and the flag for which they fought and died, let us honor and exalt on this day of remembrance, all those who have served us so gallantly, so faithfully and so well with such imperishable devotion, sacrifice and love.

"Let us in our time, make very sure that their example shall never die, and that their sacrifices will never be forgotten by a grateful American people who owe them so much,."

Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, an excellent address on the subject of freedom was delivered recently by Lt. Col. George A. Maloney, U.S. Army, at the Fourth of July observance at the Monument grounds in Washington, D.C.

Colonel Maloney, a graduate of West Point and the recipient of a number of military decorations and awards, has served in Korea, Iceland, Okinawa, and southeast Asia. He recently completed a 3-year tour with the 1st Special Forces Group, which included duty in Vietnam as commander of the 1st Corps, U.S. Special Forces, at Danang.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include Colonel Maloney's address which follows:

FREEDOM

Tonight we celebrate a great national holiday. A day which has meaning for freemen throughout the world. A day which marks the attainment by our forefathers of an individual, political, spiritual and national freedom, previously unknown. A freedom for which our forefathers paid a heavy price. A freedom which successive generations of Americans have rebought with their blood. In the 190 years of our freedom, we have learned that freedom brings responsibilities to defend it as well as rights to enjoy it.

We have learned that freedom isn't free, that it can be lost and once lost is seldom regained. We have learned that freedom lost anywhere, weakens free men everywhere. We have learned that to surrender freedom anywhere invites attack on free men everywhere.

Because we have learned this, tonight, at this very moment, this generation of Americans is making another payment for freedom. On the other side of the globe, closer to us now than California was 20 years ago, 30 nations of the free world are united in a struggle to keep the peoples of southeast Asia free.

We lead this struggle as we have led others in the past 20 years for our heritage of freedom includes the burden of free world leadership. Our forefathers pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to their struggle. The four most recent Presidents of the United States have pledged that we will honor our commitment in southeast Asia and we shall.

Our Vietnam commitment is total and extends from national to village level. Our military men, statesmen, medics and builders make their contributions both to freedom and to the improved living standards, which make freedom meaningful.

Our Viet Nam commitment is both similar to and different from others we have honored. Similar in that we are containing aggression in the form of Red inspired, Red supported, and Red directed infiltration forces. Communist forces that disguise their true identity and purposes. The Chinese Reds of Mao Tse Tung called themselves agrarian reformers. The Cuban Reds of Fidel Castro called themselves liberators. The Vietnamese Reds would be known as civil warriors and reformers.

We know better. We know them as scavengers of human misery found wherever poverty, disease and illiteracy make men desperate. We know them as false promisers of peace, progress and liberty but deliverers of immediate violence and the eventual captivity of a state society.

Our Viet Nam commitment is similar to Korea in that once again we find ourselves fighting in a difficult place. Once again, we are at the end of a long supply line, once again in a terrain which limits the effectiveness of our military machines and saps the strength of our men. Once again fighting for a small nation whose divisions and confusion are exploited by the same Communist techniques that would divide and confuse our American people.

Our Viet Nam Commitment is similar to Korea, Berlin and Cuba in that the threat of nuclear war hovers in the background limiting our efforts and lending urgency to the requirement for eventual success.

But there are also differences in our Viet Nam commitments. To a greater degree than before, people are both the objective and the tools of war. This is a war in, amongst and for people. We fight, not for cities, roads or other terrain features, but for the hearts and minds of men.

There are also differences in the timing of the efforts of our national agencies in Viet Nam. In prior wars, the military fought, then the statesmen made peace and finally the aid specialists rebuilt the devastated areas. But in this war, all of our agencies operate concurrently under a single control at the very top level of our government.

Finally and sadly, this war is different in that a small portion of our people have manifested a violent and irresponsible dissent to our national purposes and efforts. I speak not of those who seek to clarify issues within our democratic process but of those whose dissent is neither reasoned nor honest. Whose dissent reflects their craven self interest, their cruel distortion of facts and their callous support of causes detrimental to our common defense of freedom. In so doing they sully that common resolve, that unity of purpose, that universal determination which has characterized our national will in every past war. They distract our attention from the utterly magnificent fashion in which our valiant youth are conducting their defense of freedom.

I see a requirement that we insure that those of these splendid men who must die for us do so free of doubt that their sacrifice is unappreciated.

I see a requirement that we so broaden and pass on this priceless heritage of freedom that it can never be said of us that we were so involved in enjoying freedom that we couldn't successfully defend it.

His Holiness Pope Paul VI Continues His Quest for an End to the Fighting in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, His Holiness Pope Paul VI has been untiring in his efforts to bring about peace talks to resolve the Vietnam conflict, and in this quest His Holiness deserves the thanks of all mankind. I would like to insert the following excerpts, released by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, in the RECORD. I commend the Pontiff's remarks on the Vietnam question to the careful attention of my colleagues. The Holy Father's patient devotion to peace should be an inspiration to our Nation's leaders not to falter in the vital task of bringing a just peace to Vietnam.

[From the N.C.W.C. News Service]

POPE PAUL CONTINUES PEACE EFFORTS

VATICAN CITY.—Pope Paul VI is determined to press his thus-far fruitless campaign for a negotiated settlement of the war in Vietnam.

He said that although his suggestions for neutral arbitration of the war have not been successful, "we are not on this account disheartened in the pursuit of our efforts."

Vietnam, he said, is "tormented by a conflict and by struggles that make it suffer greatly and seem to have no end." He continued:

"With the worsening of the situation and the terrible prospect of a possible extension of the conflict, the demands of our apostolic ministry have spurred us to strive in every way, even blazing new trails, that a solution may be sought and achieved through frank and honorable negotiations."

He recalled that he had made "reiterated appeals both public and private" for peace in Vietnam and had left no stone unturned "to hasten the meeting of minds." He also recalled his proposal for a Christmas truce and his hopes that it would be not only prolonged but would serve as "a base for launching peace negotiations."

He indicated that he had channeled his suggestions for neutral arbitration in Vietnam through the United Nations: "Trusting once more in the work of the United Nations—of that organization that works for peace and in the 20 years of its existence has prevented so many conflicts and settled so many others—we thought it good to suggest aribtration, to be confident in neutral nations, for a pacific solution of the grave problem."

He continued:

"You well know the inconclusive outcome of our sincere and unselfish efforts in favor of peace. But we are not on this account disheartened in the pursuit of our action, for we are anxious to foster in the society of men the concord and brotherhood proclaimed by the Gospel message.

"Meanwhile we renew to the heads of state and to all men of good will—who have so generously and enthusiastically responded to our solicitude as universal father and shepherd—our sincere and profound gratitude, and the appeal to focus their thoughts on a just peace that may give those peoples liberty, order and prosperity."

Budget Bureau Policy Threatens To Endanger Soil Conservation Service Watershed Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERT BANDSTRA
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep concern over the Bureau of the Budget's recently adopted policy with regard to new projects under the U.S. Soil Conservation Service watershed program.

Since last December, the Soil Conservation Service has sent 51 new watershed work plans to the Budget Bureau for review. In the past, the Budget Bureau has checked watershed work plans and, if no objections to their economic feasibility were found, has transmitted the projects to the Congress for review and approval by the appropriate committees of the House and Senate. Under provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, projects with a single structure of more than 4,000 acre-feet capacity are sent for review and approval to the House and Senate Public Works Committees, and projects with a single structure of less than 4,000 acre-feet capacity are sent to the House and Senate Agriculture Committees. The provision for review and approval by congressional committees has been part of the law since it was enacted in 1954.

Within the last month or so, however, the Budget Bureau has changed its long-established policy and has refused to send any new watershed projects to the Congress for review and approval, regardless of the merits of any of the individual projects. As a result, all 51 new watershed work plans are still pending in the Budget Bureau and, even though there has been no change in the law, the appropriate committees of the House and Senate have not been given an opportunity to review and approve these new watershed projects. This new policy of the Budget Bureau threatens to endanger one of the most effective programs for soil and water conservation.

It is my understanding that the Budget Bureau has held up these watershed projects because of a contention that the provision for congressional review and approval of individual projects is an unconstitutional infringement on the power of the executive branch. Very frankly, I do not think this matter involves any great constitutional crisis. The Soil Conservation Service watershed program has operated under the provision for congressional review and approval of individual projects for a dozen years. During this time, the House and Senate Agriculture Committees have approved 293 projects, and the House and Senate Public Works Committees have approved 153. In other words, 446 watershed projects have been approved under the present provisions of the law, and there have been no previous complaints that this law violated the Constitution. Only last year the Congress, with the approval of the executive branch, amended the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as to permit Soil Conservation Service to provide assistance to watersheds with structures of up to 12,500 acre-feet flood detention capacity. Nothing was said at that time about the possible unconstitutionality of review and approval of these projects by congressional committees. In fact, it was not until late May of this year that Soil Conservation Service officials first learned of the Budget Bureau's objections to this procedure.

If the Budget Bureau's new policy is not reversed, and if the new watershed work plans are not sent to the Congress for review and approval, it will be extremely unfair to the local officials who have spent years preparing detailed plans for these projects. Among the projects now being held up by the Budget Bureau is the Three Mile Creek Watershed, which is of great importance to the Union County area in Iowa. This project was officially proposed in 1958 and it has been in the planning stage since January 1961, more than 5 years ago. After a great deal of hard work on the part of the local sponsors, plans for the Three Mile Creek project were sent to the Budget Bureau on April 25, 1966. This project, which I have been following closely for more than a year, would provide valuable soil conservation, flood control and recreation benefits to the Union County area. In addition, it would offer a source of municipal water supply to the town of Afton, which has been hampered by acute water shortages in the past. And, in the long run, the Three Mile Creek Watershed would provide the basis for future economic growth in the area. I feel it would be most unfortunate if this project, as well as the others pending with the Budget Bureau, were delayed by a dispute over abstract legalities.

In my opinion, the Soil Conservation Service watershed program is far too valuable to be endangered by arguments over the alleged unconstitutionality of a law which has been in operation without previous objections for a dozen years. Any question as to the constitutionality of the provision for congressional approval of projects can be resolved at a later date, when the Congress has the time to consider the matter with care. In any event, if there is anything certain about this dispute, it is that nothing in the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act authorizes the Budget Bureau to deliberately hold up projects which merit approval. I therefore think the Budget Bureau should reverse its policy of holding up watershed work plans and allow this program to move forward, as it has in the past, under the procedures established by law.

Statement Made by Irvin M. Frankel, President, American Society of Travel Agents, Presentation of Plaque to Senator Magnuson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, my friend Mr. Irvin M. Frankel, of Atlanta, Ga., is president of the American Society of Travel Agents.

The society recently paid tribute to Senator Warren G. Magnuson for his contribution to the travel agency industry and the public which it serves. Because of my respect for Mr. Frankel's distinguished leadership in the travel industry, I place his statement on that occasion in the Record at this point:

STATEMENT MADE BY IRVIN M. FRANKEL, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN SOCIETY OF TRAVEL AGENTS, PRESENTATION OF PLAQUE TO SENATOR MAGNUSON, JUNE 23, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Honored Guests and Fellow Members of ASTA, thank you very much for taking time from your busy schedules and important responsibilities to participate in this occasion.

I know that I voice the sentiments of all the members of the American Society of Travel Agents when I say that we long have looked forward to this opportunity to pay tribute to our guest of honor, Warren G. Magnuson, who—although a Senator representing the State of Washington—is, in our opinion, a Senator representing all of the United States.

During his more than 30 years of public service in the House of Representatives and the Senate, he has demonstrated that imperative quality which, in the words of Alexander Hamilton, distinguishes a representative of all the people as contrasted with a parochial approach.

"Learn to think continentally," Hamilton admonished his contemporaries.

Senator Magnuson, in answer to the demands of the present and in response to his own profound awareness of the course of history, has exceeded that heretofore valid injunction and thinks internationally.

The important legislation which marks his career in public service is monumental testimony to his fidelity to the philosophical observation that "the difference between a politician and a statesman is that a politician thinks only of the next election and a statesman thinks of the next generation."

Every proposal advocated by WARREN MAGNUSON, every piece of legislation which he has authored, sponsored and successfully has brought to enactment, is incontestible evidence of his fidelity to this concept.

We, in the American Society of Travel Agents, long have watched with deep and personal interest his devotion to furthering the best interests of all—his steadfast adherence to the principle that all legislation must be based upon equity and justice.

We are here today to express our deep appreciation of his inspired leadership and recognized wisdom during his many years of public service.

His sound imagination has assisted materially in creating a strong, self-sufficient air transportation system. He prophetically pioneered in an appreciation and understanding of the benefits which would be derived by our national economy from travel and tourism. And he, time and time again, has directed the specific attention of the nation to the tremendous contribution to our gross national product made by the independent, private enterprise businessmen—who constitute the Travel Agency industry.

He has listened sympathetically and perceptively to our problems, lauded our effort to serve the public in accordance with the highest standards of responsibility and professionalism and has given us that sound advice which is the distillation of experience and statesmanship.

No single tablet of bronze adequately could describe our appreciation of his services to our nation and, of course, to our industry.

So—we are forced to be content with the following phrases which, even at their best, are inadequate to express the full extent of our genuine sentiments.

On behalf of the American Society of Travel Agents, Senator MAGNUSON, and in accordance with the resolution adopted by our Officers and Directors, we present, with pride and pleasure, this testimonial of appreciation in recognition of your distinguished leadership and positive contributions to the Travel Agency Industry and the public which it serves; and for your significant achievements in the development of travel and tourism.

We wish you many more years of similar outstanding service to our peoples and our nation.

This tribute, Sir, is from our hearts.

Scramble for Cash Unprecedented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the President is not sending a tax increase bill to Congress at least until after the elections. Instead, he is trying to check escalating inflation resulting from wild and wasteful Federal spending by applying the monetary brakes.

Now no one knows whether the public is going through the windshield or up through the roof. L.B.J. has reached the point where, having spent too much to try to create prosperity, he is now drying up the market of free money which can create a depression. This is the price of butter and guns together. The unemployment rate is rising again and serious unemployment, particularly in the building trades, may be the result. Meanwhile, we are going up and down on an economic roller coaster.

The banks have been encouraged to buy what are called "certificates of deposit" for 5½ percent and, under the rules, a little more. This looks good because it increases their deposits. But these "certificates of deposit" are relatively short term, often 3 months. A bank must earn better—and usually far better—than 6 percent quickly to pay these high interest rates. This has shoved, and is shoving, the price of money for borrowers to ruinous rates. It is hitting the construction and other trades and will hit more. This is a new twist on robbing Peter to pay Paul and only this corkscrew administration could have nurtured it.

By unanimous consent, in this connection, I introduce in the RECORD an article by Harold B. Dorsey in the Washington Post:

SCRAMBLE FOR CASH UNPRECEDENTED

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

NEW YORK, July 10.—The scramble for cash that has been so evident in the past few weeks has reached a stage that has only rarely been experienced in this country during the 20th century. The competition for money by the savings institutions, commercial banks, non-bank lenders, Federal agencies and business borrowers is now on a knock-down, no-holds-barred basis.

One result of this condition is a distortion in normal interest rate relationships which is tending to cause violent shifts in cash flows. For instance, the recent increase in dividends paid on savings and loan shares is probably more than some of the S&L's can afford to pay out of interest earned. Nevertheless, the boost in the rates seemed to be necessary to restrain an even more embarrassing outflow of deposits to higher yields obtainable elsewhere. But the yields obtainable elsewhere are also rising in this most unusual scramble for money.

One cannot help but wonder what is going to happen to the approximately $43 billion of ordinary passbook savings deposits of the weekly reporting commercial banks. The ceiling interest rate on these deposits is only 4 percent. The depositor can probably put his money in the savings bank or the S&L next door and obtain 5 percent. Some of them could probably do better than that if they wanted to buy Certificates of Deposits issued by commercial banks or to invest their money in top quality relatively short-term debt issues of the Federal agencies and corporations.

Over $17 billion of the deposits of the commercial banks is represented by Certificates of Deposits on which the ceiling is 5½ per cent. But in the secondary markets C.D.'s maturing in six months are available on a 5.60 per cent basis. A substantial portion of the C.D's represents a temporary investment of the surplus cash of corporations.

But to the extent that the commercial banks lose the C.D. money, and it ultimately comes back to them in the form of demand deposits, the money available to the commercial banks for lending and investing would be reduced because the reserve requirements on demand deposits is nearly 3 times the recently upward revised requirement on C.D.'s.

Meanwhile, the 4½ per cent Federal Reserve discount rate (the rate which the Fed charges for its loans to member banks) is now further out of line with most other interest rates than has been in many years—if ever. The historical interest rate relationships suggest that the discount rate should have been boosted a couple of months ago.

I suggest that it has not been raised because this particular rate is considered a symbol of monetary ease or tightness and an increase under present circumstances might be a psychological shock to the financial system—although anybody that does not already know that the credit stiuation is extraordinarily tight doesn't read the newspapers.

The rarity of this financial situation makes it difficult to envision just where the scramble for cash is going to end, and what its consequences may be. It is clear that the cause of the condition is the most unusual demand for credit necessary to finance the abnormally high rate of demand for goods and services. These pressures certainly would have been less excessive if the government had decided late last year to siphon off $5-$7 billion of the purchasing power of the private sectors by boosting tax rates.

Since this step was not taken, the correctives are coming in the form of extreme tightness in the capital and credit markets and also in the form of higher prices, which reduce the ability of the economy to move units of goods and services into consumption.

How AEC Report Pictures Ann Arbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the interest of the Michigan delegation in this and the other body of Congress in the location of the Atomic Energy Commission's 200 Bev. accelerator facility on a site in our State is, I am sure, well known to all Members. I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the Detroit News on Sunday, July 10. This article, written by Mr. Robert L. Pisor, of the News Washington bureau, is one of the most lucid and comprehensive I have had the privilege of reading on this complex subject.

Mr. Pisor writes of the role of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN], in leading the Michigan effort to secure the Atomic Energy Commission research facility. The gentleman's efforts on behalf of the Michigan site have been tireless. His colleagues in the Michigan delegation have been much impressed not only with his broad knowledge of scientific and research matters, based on his background as a scientist and businessman, but also with his seemingly boundless energy on behalf of his State and his district. This work is well documented in Mr. Pisor's article.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pisor emphasizes the facts, well known to many of my colleagues, regarding the failure of the Federal Government, to date, to bring about an equitable geographical distribution of Federal research and development funds. He points out the crucial importance of such research and development funds to the economic well-being of an area's economy. And he reminds his readers of information recently published which shows that Michigan is one of the three States in the entire Nation—all of them located in the upper Midwest—which have actually suffered adverse effects due to the changing pattern of Federal expenditures in the past decade or so.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include this article in the Congressional Record:

How AEC Report Pictures Ann Arbor

(By Robert L. Pisor)

Washington, July 9.—The federal government's largest research project of the decade will cost $400 million and look very much like a doughnut-shaped pile of earth heaved up by a giant mole.

For Ann Arbor and southeastern Michigan, this molehill could mean $1 billion in payrolls and federal research and development grants over the next 10 years—and a big boost for the state's economy, industry, educational institutions and prestige.

The project is a 200 Billion Electron Volt (BEV) proton accelerator, already on the planning boards of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) as the largest machine of its kind in the world. It will be three miles around, a mile in diameter and buried under a mound of earth 30 feet high.

The 200 BEV accelerator, nearly seven times larger than its nearest competitor in Geneva, Switzerland, is looking for a home.

DECISION AWAITED

Ann Arbor, or rather a 5,700-acre section of Northfield Township just outside the university city, is one of six "finalist" sites for the accelerator.

The National Academy of Sciences selected the six communities from 200 proposed sites in 46 states.

Now the decision is up to the AEC with approval required from Congress and the President.

"The decision could come next week, although that's not very likely," one AEC source said.

"But the commission will definitely make its decision in the next several months—at the latest by the end of the year."

A "yes" vote for Ann Arbor would capture what Indiana Gov. Robert D. Branigan called "the scientific prize of the century."

CONGRESS IS CAUTIOUS

Eight years would pass after the decision before the first tiny proton particle could be rocketed around the circular accelerator at speeds nearing 186,000 miles a second.

The Joint Atomic Committee of Congress jealously refuses to yield its right to approve the project. Congressional hearings and approval and appropriations are required before the project can get under way.

Detailed designs and land surveys will take two years then four to five years for construction of the colossal machine and finally a year of preliminary testing and exploration.

By the early 1970s, more than $375 million would have been spent on a machine hidden below a gently-rising mound of earth.

A community of 2,400 physicists, technicians, mathematicians and electronics experts would spring up and hundreds more would fly in for temporary projects on the huge machine.

The annual payroll would be $60 million.

OTHER INDUSTRIES EYED

But Michigan boosters of BEV see the project as only a catalyst for an economic boom in the southeastern part of the state, stirring up expansion and creation of allied industries, surveying firms, heavy construction, housing, shopping centers and new schools.

A part of an AEC report indicates need for "tons and tons of equipment and shielding, specialized surveying, precision components to support experimental facilities, buildings for offices, laboratories and shops, housing for the thousands of the permanent staff and and housing for visiting technicians."

Many boosters expect "spin-off" industries, the tiny specialized shops that spring up almost overnight to produce sophisticated hardware for the many research projects.

These small, specialized industries crowd the areas around the Boston technological center, the space research complex in Houston and the research centers of southern California, greatly increasing the tax base, the wealth, the quality of education and the economic future of these communities.

ANN ARBOR'S CHANCES

Using a list of 43 requirements, the National Academy chose Ann Arbor, Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island, New York; Denver, Colo.; Madison, Wis.; the Sierra foothills near Sacramento, Calif.; and South Barrington (or Weston), near Chicago.

All but Denver boast of either an existing nucleus of accelerator specialists or one of the nation's outstanding universities. But Denver offers virtually unlimited room for expansion of the accelerator, an attribute strong enough to place it on the final list of six.

What are Ann Arbor's chances?

The requirements range from land suitability and available air transportation to the quality of education and medical care in the proposed communities.

The BEV site must be on solid ground, not subject to earthquakes or frequent extreme weather changes, either too hot or too cold. The home state must be able to supply up to 180 million watts of electricity without interrupting normal service and great quantities of water must be available to cool the machine.

AIRPORT AS FACTOR

The location must be close to a major national airport with connections to every major city for the convenience of technician-visitors. It must have high quality universities and colleges, good schools, museums and libraries and an active cultural life, and be near a large and vital city.

Light and heavy industry and technological activity must already exist in the site area for support of the research projects.

Next to the geological structure of the ground itself, "The nearness of a major university is absolutely essential," the AEC noted.

Only about 50 men in the United States are capable of designing and putting together a new accelerator "and many of them are strongly oriented toward university life and its associations," the report stated.

With these considerations in mind, the curious can compare Ann Arbor's chances against the other sites.

RAILROAD SERVICE

Without recommendation, the National Academy discreetly listed the six finalists in alphabetical order, noting their special qualifications or shortcomings.

Northfield Township can offer 5,700 acres about six miles north of Ann Arbor on relatively-level land and serviced by a nearby railroad.

The soil foundation of clay, sand and gravel seems to fall somewhat short of the AEC ideal, and deep pile foundations were recommended to keep the huge machine steady at all times.

But Ann Arbor is only 35 minutes from Metropolitan Airport and only 30 miles from Detroit. It has acceptable weather and climate conditions, a good industrial and technological base and an unbounded ability to supply electricity and water.

"The chief attraction of this site is its nearness to the campus of the University of Michigan," the initial report said. "A major university with strength in the physical, engineering and mathematical sciences.

STIFFEST COMPETITOR

"The opportunity for the nation's top scientists to participate in academic programs at the nearby university would aid materially in attracting them to the site."

Brookhaven in New York possesses the nation's largest (30 BEV) accelerator, and thus the best nucleus of accelerator specialists. It is within 90 minutes of New York airports and quick connections to the major eastern universities. If the need for trained technicians becomes the most important consideration, then Brookhaven would have an excellent lead.

The Madison site, within 10 miles of the University of Wisconsin and fine vocational schools, is considered by some from Michigan to be the stiffest competition. The drawbacks of severe winters, uncertain electric power capabilities and the two-hour drive to O'Hare Airport in Chicago are offset by soil conditions.

"The site seems to be ideal from the standpoint of foundation requirements in that (the machine) can be placed directly on bedrock without unusual or expensive construction necessary," the study noted.

The site study committee accepted the Sierra foothills near Sacramento with the note that "it would be prudent to provide protection against seismic shocks."

UNIVERSITIES NEARBY

Although the airport and cultural facilities of San Francisco are two hours drive away, the weather and electric power conditions are considered excellent.

And the site "would probably be attractive to many highly competent physicists and engineers now in the design group at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory" and at Berkeley and Stanford.

South Barrington has approximately the same soil problems as Ann Arbor, but it is only an hour from O'Hare Airport and very convenient to nearly all the universities of the Midwest.

These are the AEC's assessment of the geological, physical and cultural assets of the six proposed sites.

But there is one other recommended "consideration.'"

This is the consideration that "a new center of excellence be established," a proposal which would knock California and New York out of the running.

PLEA FOR GRANT EQUITY

With $1 billion to spend in research and development funds, the federal government can easily create a new center of excellence. This is the chief hope of Midwestern congressmen seeking the accelerator.

The most active of all might be Michigan Congressman Weston E. Vivian, a Democrat from Ann Arbor and the only Ph.D. in electronics in Congress.

In a plea to the Senate to spread federal research funds more equally among the various states, Vivian noted that the U.S. government spends nearly $18 billion a year in such grants.

But 96.8 percent of these funds go to only half the states and most of that to the East and West coasts.

PROMINENT LAG

In 1963, the north central states of Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Wisconsin received $18 per capita in federal research and development (R&D) money, compared with the Pacific coast states with $181 and New England's $108.

Residents of the north central states received back only $24 in R&D funds for every $1,000 paid in federal taxes, compared with $342 received in the Pacific states and $110 in New England.

"Research money draws the brains, the idea man, the innovators and entrepreneurs to the recipient companies and institutions," Vivian testifies.

"And development money builds the technological capability and trains the working force which can give these organizations a virtually insurmountable advantage over competitors for commercial, as well as military, markets."

LURED FROM MIDWEST

Vivian, who received his Ph.D. from the University of Michigan, noted that the Midwest produces about 40 percent of all the advanced degree scientists and engineers, but that most are pulled away by the lure of federal R&D funds placed elsewhere.

Dr. Roger E. Bolton, in a recent book on "Defense Purchases and Regional Growth," singled out the north central states as "least beneficiaries" of federal funds since 1962.

Of all 50 states, Bolton contended in his economic study, only three suffered adversely or saw their economic growth depressed by shifts in federal spending. These are Michigan, Wisconsin and Indiana.

Flag Festivals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, every Fourth of July millions of Americans pay tribute to the spirit of patriotism and renew their dedication to our country's ideals. I have just returned from Vietnam where every day in the jungles and swampy ricelands young Americans are paying a very special kind of tribute to patriotism—a tribute in blood and lives.

The sobering sight of these young men going into battle brings to one's mind the question: Where does their dedication come from, what loyalty inspires their sacrifice? I believe that the answer is in their loyalty to our flag and to our young people every Independence Day, and though they may never be given such terrible trial, they are the strong foundation on which our country's strength rests.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record two newspaper articles—one from the Sippican Sentinel and an editorial from the New Bedford Standard-Times—which give an account of the patriotic programs recently held in the towns of Marion and Fairhaven, Mass., in my district. These fine programs are an example of the way our young people are imbued with the spirit of patriotism and respect for our flag. I think that the citizens who participated are deserving of great praise for these outstanding tributes to our Nation's ideals.

The articles follow:

[From the Sippican (Mass.) Sentinel]

In elaborate and impressive ceremonies at the Sippican School on Tuesday, Flag Day, 20 students of grades five and six were cited for excellence in citizenship and received awards and certificates in the First Citizenship Awards made by the Sippican Society, sponsored by the Sippican Woman's Club in memory of the late Mrs. Irma Hunt of Marion.

Mrs. C. Joseph Nowak, club president, made the presentations.

The stirring program began at 10 a.m., in the crowded school auditorium with a Flag raising ceremony and Color guard by Girl Scouts of grade 6, followed by a salute to the Flag led by Joseph Burke, a member of the Town Committee for Flag Day. Diane Hickey then read Governor John A. Volpe's Flag Day Proclamation. "The Flag Goes By" was presented by grades 1, 2 and 3; followed by singing of the Star-Spangled Banner by grades 4, 5, 6, and the special education class, led by Mrs. Rhona Blasdale.

The special induction ceremony of the Sippican Society was presented by guest speaker Mrs. Nowak.

Dr. Joseph C. Kunces, superintendent of schools, made the response and was later presented a Flag, as an outstanding example of the ideals set forth in the citizenship program, by Miss Allen, in a surprise ceremony.

The program closed with the children singing "America the Beautiful," ringing throughout the auditorium.

The special program kicked-off the "21 Day Salute to the Flag," in Marion and was applauded by the Flag Day Committee appointed by Marion selectmen. Committeemen are Donald Perry, Mrs. Nowak, Miss Etta-Hix Allen, Sippican School Principal; Mrs. Virginia Pruchnik, Mr. Burke, William F. Henry, Mrs. Robert Thompson and Lawrence P. Pangaro, chairman. The complete program will end on July 4, Independence Day, at the Marion Horse Show.

Awards and certificates were presented to the children based on: Courage to stand for high ideals; honesty and fairness; dependability; cooperation, and consideration for others.

Sixth graders receiving the citizen pin awards and Sippican Society memberships were: Ellen Adams, Richard Burrell, Gary Cobb, Daniel Gibbs, Diane Hickey, Elizabeth Kunces, Susan Marini, Donald Nielsen and Linda Pina.

Fifth graders receiving certificates and junior memberships were: Maureen Burke, Russell Burns, Debra Cobb, Sara Converse, Diana Cruz, Kathyrn Heuston, Robin Jenny, Joseph Marini, Vicky Sherman, Elin Waagen and Martin Wickenden.

During the ceremonies all of the children were presented with Flags to make the program one that will long be remembered. Principal Allen stressed that the program for next year will include junior memberships for grades 1 through 5 and awards to grade 6 as was done this year.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times]

FESTIVAL OF FLAGS

Today marks the opening of Fairhaven's four-day Festival of Flags, a unique patriotic celebration designed to honor the U.S. Flag and to demonstrate support for the nation's Viet Nam policy.

Sponsoring it is the Fairhaven Association of Businessmen and a hard-working committee headed by Kenneth Lavallee. Through their efforts, this star-spangled spectacular will bring to the community parades, demonstrations, pageants, displays and ceremonies—all relating to the Flag, the military and the American effort in space.

A representative of the Japanese ambassador will be on hand for re-creation of the town's famous 1918 samurai sword presentation; missiles and space capsules will be demonstrated; military and civic leaders will speak at various gatherings, and Flags will be displayed throughout Fairhaven.

Undoubtedly, thousands will turn out to view this timely display of patriotism, and The Standard-Times wishes the Festival of Flags good fortune and good weather, for this program in behalf of love of country deserves the broadest exposure.

Salute to Our Two-Party System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ROBERT WATKINS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

SALUTE TO OUR TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

(An address by the Honorable Gerald R. Ford before the American Heritage Foundation's Northeastern Regional Vote Workshop, Philadelphia, Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, July 11, 1966)

When those who are deep in the political battle—like Mr. Bailey and me—are invited to give non-partisan talks, we are forced to make some major readjustments in the content of our remarks.

Mr. Bailey and I have to make such readjustments not only because of the nature of this audience but also because of the place selected for this conference. We are meeting in the City of Brotherly Love. We shouldn't forget that this evening.

Among other things, we have to write a new speech. That basic talk for partisan gatherings which we give over and over again has to be scrapped. Even the jokes have to go because partisan political humor just doesn't seem funny to those outside the ranks of party faithful.

Tonight we salute the two-party system, the political system that our Nation has had almost from its beginnings. As the representative of what is temporarily the minority party, I want to thank the American Heritage Foundation for the valuable work which it has done for many years to give life and meaning to that system. I congratulate the Foundation on the inauguration of these Regional Vote Workshops, and I wish you success in your 1966 Nonpartisan Register and Vote Campaign.

The work that the Foundation is doing looks to nurturing in the hearts of all citizens the ideals of democratic government. Unless these ideals flourish there, no constitution, no law, certainly no political party or its leadership can maintain the health of our political system.

In 1960 the Democrats alleged a "missile gap." Republicans from General Eisenhower on down denied the charge. In 1966 the Republicans contend there is a White House "credibility gap." John Bailey will protest vehemently. But both of us will likely agree there is a "commitment gap" on the part of too many Americans. What we need is a commitment to broad, staunch, and constructive support for the two-party system.

Several centuries ago, the Italian poet Dante put it this way: "The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who, in a period of moral crisis, maintain their neutrality." My plea is that all American discard political neutrality and enlist in the battle to preserve the two-party system.

What is called for, I sincerely believe, is a decision by more and more Americans to renounce political neutrality during elections and to bring their entire individual effort to bear on behalf of candidates who meet their rigid specifications of honor and outlook.

As individuals, you have the responsibility and duty to become actively engaged in partisan politics. I am not here as a recruiter for the Republican Party although I will be glad to take applications at the door. What I am saying is that you cannot, as individuals, expect to achieve concrete political results if you are unwilling to join and work for the party of your choice. It is only within a party that you can help to determine party policy, help select candidates for party nomination and work for their eventual election. It is only within a political party that you can till and fertilize the soil which will produce the kind of legislators who will, for example, get some of our basic problems, state and national, out of petty politics. Many like myself in the political arena are disappointed that more of our highly motivated citizens are not working as actively as they should be in a political party.

What the Foundation is aiming at is the broadest type of citizen participation in the political process. It is a goal that deserves the unstinting support of both great American political parties.

The political party is the agency, and really the only agency, through which citizens can fully and effectively participate in the political process.

Where there is freedom, there will be more than a single political party, for free men will not all think alike.

It may seem strange that the founding fathers viewed the growth of parties with alarm. They made no provision for them in the Constitution. George Washington warned his countrymen against them in his Farewell Address. Our forefathers' apprehension was not without reason. Political wars in the England of their time were characterized by bitter party strife and divisive partisanship.

It was Thomas Jefferson who started our two-party system. You might say that as vice-president he was the first minority leader on Capitol Hill.

Jefferson thereby added to the constitutional checks and balances another safeguard in our experiment in democratic government. It has saved the nation from the oppression which so often characterizes those countries where a single political party dominates every aspect of political life and, unchecked, stifles all dissent. And it has saved the nation from the anarchy and chaos which so often characterizes those countries where every conceivable faction organizes itself into an independent political party.

Elihu Root called the two-party system a sign of political maturity. The two-party system guarantees a wide appeal to the electorate and it increases the chances for coherence and stability in government. It avoids the irresponsibility of factionalism which, at best, operates to allow popular control in a one-party state. More important than these theoretical considerations is the fact that the two-party system, in the context of America, her institutions and traditions, has met the test of history. It works. It is an imoprtant part of that complex set of balances and mechanisms that have made the American experiment in democratic government the world's greatest success story.

Under Jefferson's innovation, America has prospered, maintaining always her commitment to both majority rule and freedom of dissent. Many countries, particularly in Latin America, have copied our Constitution. And in many cases they have met with repeated failure. One of the keys to understanding why is their inability to develop a two-party system.

A goal of this Northeastern Regional Vote Workshop is to consider ways to sharpen the cutting edges of our two-party system. The problem was never stated better than it was some forty years ago by the prominent British writer, Mr. J. A. Spender. The problem, he said, "is to convince our fellow countryment that to have political convictions, to join a party, to work for it, and to support it out of their purses, so far as means allow, are among duties of all citizens, and cannot be neglected without serious harm to the country." This is one of the great unsolved problems of democracy. Until we solve it, our two-party system and the very quality of our government will be defective.

The indices of citizen involvement in politics do not tell an encouraging story in the United States. The percentage of citizens of voting age who have voted in recent presidential elections has hovered about the level of 60 per cent. In off-year Congressional elections, it has been running between 45 and 49 per cent. In local elections a turnout of 30 to 40 per cent is common. These levels of voter participation do not compare favorably with those of advanced nations with a democratic form of government in other parts of the world.

With less than two-thirds of the potential electorate actually voting, how many less ever actively work for a political party or for candidates for office? And of those who work—performing the important role of informing their fellow citizens—how many less ever make a financial contribution? The number gets smaller and smaller, and diminishing with it is the effectiveness of our two-party system.

Particularly acute is the need for an adequate financial foundation, one consistent with democratic principles. Herbert Alexander, Staff Director of President Kennedy's Commission on Campaign costs, has put the costs of 1964 campaigns at 200 million dollars. Such expenditures are not unjustifiably large in campaigns directed toward a potential electorate of more than 100 million who are asked to vote for at least 200,000 offices of some significance.

Only about 10 per cent of adult Americans ever contribute to election campaigns. This figure is significantly higher than it was fifty or even twenty-five years ago, but it is still far too low. It is not healthy for the costs of democracy to be met by so few. The day when political parties can sit back and depend on large contributors must end. Our election costs must be covéred without jeopardizing our public morals. Our goal should be securing ever more contributors to our political parties on a regular year-round basis. The wider the base of party funds, the less suspicion there can be of improper influence. There is a job to be done.' Recent data from the University of Michigan Survey Research Center shows that less than half of those interviewed had ever heard of efforts to raise money for campaign expenses. Eighty-five had never been asked to contribute. Only one out of fifty had ever participated in a campaign fund-raising drive. When asked if they would contribute if approached, a fourth said yes, while 58 per cent replied no.

Our failure here is deplorable—and even more so because we raise annually throughout the country large sums for welfare and other community needs. Is the well-being of our political system any less important? With hard work and organization, and with the help of groups like the American Heritage Foundation, our political parties can meet this test. My own party has made strides in this direction. Since 1963 a substantial portion of the operating budget of the Republican National Committee has been met by annual ten-dollar sustaining memberships. In 1964, through the extensive use of direct mail and television appeals, 72 per cent of the contributions for the Republican presidential campaign came in sums less than 500 dollars. Only 30 per cent of the contributions to the Democrats came in these smaller sums. But establishing the measuring rod at 500 dollars is still setting it awfully high. There is much more that both parties can do and must do to interest the individual citizen of limited means in investing in our political process. Until we do—until the costs of democracy are apportioned democratically—our two-party system will not be doing the best job it can.

In the field of legislation there is also much that can be done. Efforts here are generally aimed at restraining abuses in raising and spending campaign funds.

I suggest that it is time to emphasize the need for adequate financing of parties and candidates through mass contributions of small amounts. The present methods of fund-raising too often shut out of elective office men and women who lack substantial personal funds or lack personal access to great wealth.

There are other steps that can be taken to lighten the burden of campaign costs—notably modifying the restrictions of Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act—the equal time provision—which operates to prevent television and radio stations from providing free time to candidates for office.

Those who discuss the inadequate participation of citizens in the political process generally center their fire on the citizen. He is denounced by critics as apathetic, uninformed, and uninterested.

I feel that the indictment must be extended to cover politicians and perhaps others in our society. If the citizen is uninterested, is this lack of interest due to some degree to the failure of politicians to offer something that will arouse his interest? If he is uninformed, is it because much political oratory is not really informative? Some will contend—perhaps it's an alibi—that they just can't get the facts from any source.

There is need for drastic reform of campaign procedures that go back to the horse-and-buggy era. Something in this direction is being done by the Republican National Committee. On the suggestion of President Eisenhower, Chairman Bliss has a commission at work studying the quadrennial national convention with a view to streamlining this venerable but soporific institution.

This is a start, but much more is needed if campaigns are better to serve the purpose of spreading information and capturing public interest . . .

In 1968 I hope that televised debates between presidential candidates, so successful in attracting public interest in the 1960 campaign, will be conducted again. I see little merit in the argument that any incumbent president should not engage in debate with his opponent. I believe President Kennedy would have debated his Republican challenger in 1964 had he lived to run for reelection—and the voters would have been the beneficiaries.

If, however, the candidates themselves are unwilling to engage in debate, they could designate spokesmen to participate in joint televised appearances on their behalf.

Debate between the parties should be practiced far more widely than it is at present. Although I attach special importance to debate in presidential campaigns, there should be a running debate between party spokesmen at all political levels at all times. There are always important issues. There are always differences of opinion on some of them. The parties would be strengthened, the public would be better informed, and policy decisions would be made more wisely if we argued out things before the public.

To talk of the two-party system is to invite attention to the woes of the minority party. I shall refrain from inflicting on you any long list of complaints, but I do want to express one fear which, if justified, should be of concern to all regardless of party.

It is not easy for the minority to make its voice heard. In this age of mass communication, the Office of the President dominates the American political scene. The eyes of the nation and the world are fixed upon it. And rightly so. Its power is awesome, as is the responsibility which confronts the man who possesses it. It is power to do enormous good. But the great power to do good is, at its root, simply great power. Free men must be able to check it and challenge it, lest it consume them.

If free men cannot check and challenge it, then we do have one-party rule. If it is becoming increasingly difficult for them to do so, then we have begun a journey down a dangerous road.

We seek in our political life the attainment of justice and the containment of power. The two-party system plays a vital role in the struggle to achieve these goals. By providing debate and discussion it helps us travel a much surer course toward justice for all our citizens.

The minority must be able to get its views out to the people. I hope that the minority State of the Union Message, first delivered this year, will become a permanent institution—given time and prominence corresponding to that of the President.

Although I speak tonight for the minority, the Republicans, I do not believe that those in the minority can or should sit back and bide their time. There are some, a very few fortunately, who argue that the minority shoul await a national disaster at home or abroad and then move in, pick up the pieces and build from the shambles. This I contend is neither the tradition nor the heritage of the Republican Party in the 1960's. This was not the role of the Republican Party under Lincoln or Eisenhower. It was not the role of the Democrats in their dark days in the minority in the 1920's. We must by the competence of our candidates, by the record of legislators and administrators and by the philospohy that we espouse earn the respect of our fellow citizens.

My suggestions only touch the surface. In the final analysis the future of our two-party system depends on the courage and conviction of all Americans—of whatever political stripe—and their commitment to the values of majority rule and freedom of dissent.

These values are the heritage of all Americans. They are values that will be preserved only through strengthening the two-party system.

Vets of Famed 4th Marine Division, Spearhead of Many Pacific Campaigns, Received Warm Aloha Upon Visit to World War II Base in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, probably the most popular and the most captivating of all of Hawaii's many-splendored charms is its friendly spirit of aloha. That this charming spirit of aloha has not been diluted with the coming of urbanization to the Hawaiian archipelago was recently demonstrated by the people on the island of Maui.

The valley islanders displayed their oldtime aloha when they welcomed 129 veterans of World War II's 4th Marine Division. The ex-marines recently returned for a nostalgic visit to their wartime home in the Hawaiian Islands. The beautiful valley island of Maui was the division's home base before and after their rugged Pacific campaigns.

Organized by capable County Chairman Eddie Tam and Richard E. Nawson, the welcoming party of 2,000 Mauians greeted the World War II veterans and their families with hundreds of fresh flower leis and Hawaiian music. Indeed, the islanders' aloha was as cordial as it was 21 years ago when the 4th Marine Division called Maui its home.

Reporter Charles C. Young's heartwarming account of the nostalgic return of the 4th Marine Division veterans appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of June 27, 1966. I now submit the newspaper article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, June 27, 1966]

WORLD WAR II MARINE VETS RECEIVE BIG ALOHA ON VALLEY ISLE

(By Charles C. Young)

KAHULUI, MAUI.—Nearly 2,000 Mauians were waiting with leis when 129 World War II veterans of the Fourth Marine Division arrived with their families yesterday for a nostalgic reunion.

For many an ex-marine it was a first look at Maui in 21 years.

The Valley Island was the home base for the division before and after some of the Pacific's bloodiest fighting.

Carl Dearborn, a Whittier, California, mail carrier, said "I knew we would get a big reception but I never anticipated anything like this."

Dearborn is a former member of Company F, 2nd Battalion, 25th Marine Regiment.

Three plane loads of old marines arrived yesterday at Kahului's new airport terminal.

Camp Maui at Kokomo was their home in 1944–45 in between battles to secure Roi-Namur, Saipan, Tinian and Iwo Jima.

They arrived yesterday from the division's annual reunion in Los Angeles.

They came to Maui in three Aloha Airlines flights arriving between 5:15 p.m. and 8:10 p.m. last night.

Many Mauians had answered County Chairman Eddie Tam's call for volunteers to pick flowers and string 200 leis. Approximately 500 leis were received.

A huge banner on the terminal read, "Maui Welcomes Our Fourth Marines."

The veterans and their wide-eyed families passed down a path of young girls with leis for them on one side and red-capped members of the new Camp Maui chapter of the Marine Corps League.

The Marine Corps League members included five former members of the Fourth Marine Division who now make their homes on Maui.

There was some disappointment at the non-appearance of Colonel Joseph J. McCarthy, a Fourth Marine Division Medal of Honor winner, who could not make the trip.

The persons who came the furthest to meet one of the returning vets were Police Lieutenant and Mrs. Leslie C. Medeiros with their grandchildren, Lelie Jo and Benjamin, of Honolulu.

The Medeiroses were there to greet Henry De Loof, a corporal and a trooper in the Michigan state police who retires next year.

De Loof served with the Fourth Marine Division's military police battalion as a motorcycle patrolman when Medeiros, a police sergeant, also worked out of the Makawao district police station at Paia.

Mrs. John Johnson of Wailuku saw De Loof and remembered him as the M.P. who used to patrol past her house on his motorcycle. The Medeiroses and De Loof have corresponded through the years.

Mr. and Mrs. T. S. Shin of Wailuku were there to greet their friend, Charles Bateman, of Huntington, Long Island, New York, who arrived with his wife Virginia and daughter, Carol, 19.

Bateman served with Headquarters Company, 3rd Battalion, 23rd Marine Regiment.

Many of the returning former Maui Marines inquired about friends they knew here in World War II.

Joseph Irby, formerly of the 25th Regiment, now a steel fabricator at Gulport, Mississippi, inquired for the Harry Stibbards who are now residing in Honolulu. Mrs. Stibbard's hula troupe used to play Camp Maui on the local U.S.O. circuit.

Ken Edwards, an apartment house builder in Atlanta, Georgia, and his wife, were greeted by Mr. and Mrs. Ken Kuwahara of Paia.

Edwards, then a captain in the First Battalion, 23rd Marines, often visited the Kuwaharas when stationed at Camp Maui. They have corresponded through the years. Mrs. Kuwahara said the Edwardses every year at Christmas have sent them picture cards of their growing family.

Chairman Eddie Tam and Richard E. Mawson, co-chairman of the homecoming, had the combined Rogers Akiu and Rena Ching troupes keeping the wives and daughters entranced with their hula dancing from a raised platform within the terminal.

India—Funnel for Foreign Aid Waste

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the President recently proposed that we give an amount equal to approximately 90 percent of our annual consumption of wheat to one nation, India. While this might seem humanitarian on the surface, the more that the recipient nation is studied, the more questionable the gift becomes. India is the pious neutralist state which seems to see little difference between communism and capitalism. They in effect say a plague on both of your houses. They supposedly see some moral position in neutrality, although I fail to see their logic.

Aside from political and philosophic considerations, there is the very realistic and practical consideration that this Nation is ill equipped to utilize what we give them, and in many ways we are wasting billions of dollars which we can ill afford to squander. A most perceptive article appears in Look magazine's July 12, 1966, issue which highlights many of these problems of ignorance, antipathy, religious taboo, and poverty. It is well worth studying before we contemplate pouring billions into a bottomless funnel in India which could better be used elsewhere in the world if we feel we must spend but, from many standpoints, would better be left unspent.

[From Look Magazine, July 12, 1966]

INDIA: TOO POOR TO BE EFFECTIVE—TOO BIG TO BE IGNORED

One-seventh of the world's people are Indians. One million more are born every month. For India, this is the arithmetic of desperation. It is an equation that hangs like a black cloud over a proud subcontinent struggling to become self-sufficient but frighteningly close to drowning in a human deluge. Out of a long past came the tradition that gave the world such heart-clenching beauty as the Taj Mahal (above), but that same tradition can keep a picket-ribbed peasant from killing the rat that is eating his precious grain. A kaleidoscope of grandeur, squalor, hope and futility, India is a pain-racked land that reveals man at his noblest and his dismal worst. Angry rioter, fly-encrusted villager, Brahmin patrician and scabrous beggar, the people of India are at war with themselves, their neighbors and the elements, and they are winning few battles. Yet India is not all bad news. It is making advances that would be stunning in any but a land with stunning problems. It is slowly grasping the urgency of change. Though poverty, population, the weight of custom and war dog India's attempts to move ahead, her half-billion people must be reckoned with in any assessment of Asia's realities. For a look at the complexity of this faltering giant, see the following pages:

INDIRA GANDHI: LADY ASTRIDE THE INDIAN TIGER

On most mornings at 8:30, Indira Gandhi walks swiftly out of her white bungalow in New Delhi, blinking uncomfortably in the glaring sunlight and frowning vaguely. The lines around her mouth recall her late father, Jawaharlal Nehru. Collected on her lawn in tidy groups or huddled under a striped awning are varicolored clumps of Indians come for her autograph, to seek advice, voice a complaint or just to lay eyes on the leader of India's half-billion people. She moves briskly among them, gathering a silken sari about her, gracious but business-like. Those who came for pictures with her have already been shuffled into the proper formations—facing the sun, small ones down front, tall ones in the rear. She pauses briefly for the cameras, accepts their bouquets, murmurs good wishes, glides on to the next delegation.

As soon as she has left a group, security men hustle them out, some obviously wondering whether they ever really saw her. After the audiences, she drives off to her office and another day as the leader of the world's second most populous country. Hers is no enviable task. On any given day, there may be bloody rioting in Calcutta or Kerala, reports of villagers selling their children for food in Orissa state, noisy demonstrations in Parliament by the opposition, acid-tinged disparagement by members of her own Congress party, intelligence warnings of Chinese troop maneuvering on India's northern borders or Pakistani muscle-flexing to the west.

The hordes of foreign journalists who descended on Delhi in January, when Mrs. Gandhi became her country's first woman prime minister, are gone now. Left are all the painful decisions, the Himalayan-sized problems and the desperate need. In the press galleries of Parliament, the bars of posh Bombay hotels and the dismal warrens of North Calcutta, cynics speak slightingly of her as a weak executive picked by party moguls as the person they could best control. "What the country needs is a strong man," they say.

Indira Gandhi is aware of the rumors. But she is more aware that her country is in its worst crisis in 19 crisis-filled years of independence. She expects no special sympathy because she's a woman.

The Chinese attack that bloodied India's nose in 1962 also undermined its position as the voice of the noncommitted nations. But Mrs. Gandhi sees no reason for anxiety. "We have never attempted to be the leader of the nonaligned," she says. "We believe in certain values—peace and freedom—and if we became a leader, it was through the force of circumstances. We were able to express what was in the hearts and minds of still-subject peoples. Many are now free and no longer need the voice." But she still believes India has a mission. "Because of our population and our geographical position," she says, "what happens in India is important to the rest of the world. We believe the best way to play a useful role in world affairs is to be stable, united, strong and independent." Sporadic probing of Indian defenses has kept the country nervous about its big neighbor, China. "We were fully aware of the tension between our two ideologies," she says, "but we thought that China might change. The struggle is between two methods of achieving the welfare of the people, and the value of the Indian experiment is that it is succeeding."

How serious is the Chinese menace? "China is a constant threat," she acknowledges. "We have a long border, and we have to be vigilant. It is hard to speculate about China's intentions. Everybody who comes back from there has a different opinion. But all Chinese have viewed part of India's territory as theirs. Even the Nationalists had maps showing that." Then she smiles mischievously. "Of course, we have equally old maps which show quite different things." Famine, riots and politics grab headlines, but she thinks beyond them to another problem: India's "brain drain." "Many of our bright young people go to the U.S. to study and stay because there are more opportunities there. Obviously, we cannot match the U.S. in opportunities for research or facilities. That's where ideals come in. We've been criticized for putting ideals above pragmatism, but it's only devotion to ideals which can persuade people to give up an easy life, come back and identify with the problems here."

The weight of custom, she admits, is also keeping some of India's most promising talent from returning. "Some of our younger people abroad would come back if they felt there would be recognition of their talent, but they cannot function under the old setup, under the old ways. So the job of my government is to create an atmosphere which will make it easier for them to return and do their job."

Custom is only one of Mrs. Gandhi's enemies. After her spring visit to the U.S., critics in and out of the Congress party accused her of selling out to the Johnson Administration and of abandoning Nehru's socialist programs. Ex-Defense Minister V. K. Krishna Menon, once a close friend, called her foreign policy "drifting flotsam and jetsam."

But Indira Gandhi, like her humble predecessor, Lal Bahadur Shastri, has chosen to turn aside such attacks with soft replies while getting on with the business of pulling India from the edge of the abyss. She has worked to beat off famine with increased shipments of U.S. food and cautious incentives for foreign investment in fertilizer plants. She has stood up to Congress party snipers by reminding them that she worked closely with her father to build a socialist India. But she also warned them: "If I feel that a departure from Nehru's policy is necessary because India's future calls for it, I will not hesitate to suggest such changes." At the same time, she is refurbishing her third-world credentials by calling key nonaligned leaders to confer in Delhi. With the prospect of a national election next February, the assaults on her policies can be expected to mount. But the Indian pols, who overrated Nehru and underrated Shastri, may yet have to revise their charts on Indira Gandhi.

India: Angry, Hungry, Stubborn and Proud

(By Ernest Dunbar)

As I walked through the village, an acetylene sun burned down from a cloudless sky. At my side was a young Peace Corps nurse, six weeks in India, who had come to teach the country people public-health practices. Flies and filth were everywhere. Open drains coursed over the dusty soil, and small children ran barefoot, dirty and thin, over human excrement. As we walked up a back street, we heard the sound of a child crying. We drew near and found the source, an infant girl huddled on the doorstep of a mud hut, covered with flies and bawling plaintively. Her mother was nowhere to be seen. Women and men passed by without glancing at this common sight. The nurse started toward the child, then checked herself and pulled back. She advised me not to interfere, and we walked on. Curious, I asked her why we did not do something for the child. "The villagers may misunderstand," she answered, "and I do not want to jeopardize the relationships I have carefully built up." She told me about a Peace Corps agricultural volunteer in another settlement who had planted a small garden near his house to show the villagers how to cultivate nutrition-rich vegetables to fortify their lean diet. Although he chose a small, barren plot, a village elder had berated him for planting land that was not his own.

Both incidents were symbolic of India. A bottomless need, a forest of taboos and a painful clutching for the answer that will help people who require that help—on their very special terms. I still have not shaken that baby from my memory. Hers was another of the vivid portraits I was to carry away from India. India beggars the journalist's tidy bag of words. It refuses to be catalogued with the same fierce stubbornness with which it often refuses to be governed. India can be a wizened six-year-old with hand out, a smooth professional trained to pick out not just the foreigner but the *American* tourist. Or it can be a sari-clad Delilah dancing tipsily on the edge of a hotel-lobby fountain on her way home from a late-night party. It can be a naked holy man sitting, pencil-like legs folded under, by the side of a dusty road, staring off into some distant Nirvana. Or the anger-swollen face of a rioter hurling a brick through the windshield of your passing car. And yet India is more than all of these.

In her most trying season in 19 years of nationhood, India is looking up toward the heavens of greatness from the depths of despair.

The Big Famine of 1966, which now appears to be less critical than the panicky, frightening early forecasts, is just the latest of India's agonies. Since it wrested independence from Britain in 1947, India has been wrenched by a succession of crises that have periodically threatened to pull down the structure its leaders have worked to erect. With six distinct ethnic groups, 845 languages and dialects, seven major religions and two hostile cultures—of the Hindi-speaking peoples in the North and the Tamil- and Telugu-speaking minorities in the South—India holds within itself the explosive seeds of disruption.

Though India's problems are dizzying, two stand out as paramount: The masses must be fed, and the birthrate must be reduced. Ironically, for any country but India, the progress already made in increasing the production of grain would have been spectacular. Since 1951, India's output of foodstuffs has risen 55 percent. But in the same span, the population has risen by 33 percent. Currently, India's food production is expanding at the annual rate of three percent, but births are still rising at almost 2.5 percent.

The present food shortage is a ghastly reminder of what can happen if anything occurs that jars this shaky equilibrium. Last year, the monsoon rains upon which farmers rely were inadequate, and a drought followed. As a result, early this year, India found itself 12 million tons short of the food grains it needs to keep its population at even the scant subsistence level. In recent months, stepped-up shipments of U.S. wheat have been rushed to Indian ports at the volume of one million tons per month. Other countries have also contributed to the anti-famine grainlift. But sending food to India and getting it into the bellies of the hungry are not the same thing. Bad storage facilities, a clumsy system of distribution, a lack of a good road network are all serious hurdles. And there is little sense of emergency. Thus, while wheat piles up in Calcutta warehouses, villagers in remote areas may still be woefully short of food for the one meal a day that is the maximum for many. Although the gloomy forecasts of millions of famine deaths made by Indian and foreign observers now seem exaggerated, people are succumbing in rising numbers to hunger-connected diseases. A Western health expert told me in Delhi: "Indians have always looked at food from the standpoint of *survival* rather than nutrition. When you pull the nutritional average below the danger point, lots of people will die from a lot of other things."

India has another hurdle that hangs up the famine fight as it does a lot of other efforts to move ahead: the barrier of custom. Many Indians are traditionally rice-eaters, and a large part of the population will not eat wheat. Others who do eat wheat dislike the hard-kernel American variety furnished as aid. As I stood on a beach in Kerala, watching fishermen pull in a net heavy with protein-rich fish, one of them dropped his end of the net and rushed over to me, making begging gestures to his mouth. He was a rice-eater, and eating fish was as objectionable to him as eating certain kinds of Indian food might be to an American. He will not change easily.

Religious beliefs keep predominantly Hindu Indians from killing the 2½ billion rats that are eating an estimated 20 percent of the country's food grains. Peace Corps volunteers in one Rajasthan hamlet got into trouble with villagers when they poisoned some of rodents that had overrun their small apartment. The villagers themselves normally caught rats, took them out into the countryside and released them. Religion also decrees that Indians shall not kill the 200 million cows that wander across India's fields, lie in her streets and rummage hungrily among piles of food in the bazaars. Hindus, devout in their belief that a cow may be someone's ancestor or friend returned from death in another form, bitterly resent being told by foreigners that many of these animals are unproductive consumers of food and ought to be destroyed.

Custom hampers India's attack upon the second overriding problem: too many people. A young mother of eight children hovering on the edge of existence may refuse to let a male doctor insert a conception-preventing plastic loop into her uterus only because he is a male. She may wish to have some sort of birth-control aid—and that shift in attitude is the real revolution in India—but is unable to bring herself to let a male physician perform the task. Yet India is short on both female doctors and female technicians, who might acceptably perform the same service, and there is no prospect that they will be produced for years. In a society where disease and other calamities have taken the lives of so many children in the past, villagers still feel they must raise large broods to insure the surivial of some offspring who can help out now and take care of them in old age. So five-year-olds walk around bearing infants on their backs, while their again-pregnant mothers, virtually human factories, labor with husbands in the fields. And the brutal cycle continues.

But though India has not yet managed to bring births under control, it has made impressive inroads against death. In the last 15 years, the average Indian's life-span has been raised from 35 to 50 years of age. What should be a source of joy is not always that. Although food output is rising slightly faster than the birthrate, it has not kept pace with the combination of more births and less deaths. The result is that India has ever more mouths to feed but less to feed them with. U.S. food shipments may ease but cannot solve that problem.

While wrestling with the twin nightmares of famine and overpopulation, India must also worry about and devote precious resources to coping with external enemies. The long-standing dispute with Pakistan, which flashed into open warfare last August, drains Indian energies and resources away from the pressing work of internal development. Kashmir, the largely Muslim state that Hindu India acquired at Independence, is the prize that remains the burr of contention between the two countries. Pakistan presses for a plebiscite that might give the Kashmir Muslim majority an opportunity to vote themselves into Pakistan, India, in which the issue raises passions hardly to be dreamt of in the West, refuses to discuss the ceding of a region that is the strategic gateway (for the Chinese as well as the Pakistanis) to her heartland. Defiant and inflated by the victories they insist they won over Pakistan during the abortive 50-day sumer war of 1965, the Indians have turned their backs on any thought of compromise in Kashmir. (Among the grievances that the hypersensitive Indians nurse against the U.S. is the notion that America somehow wishes to engineer the accession of Kashmir to Pakistan.)

India's other—and far more serious—external enemy is its mammoth neighbor to the north, China. China is a dragon 2,000 miles long, the length of the border India shares with China and Chinese-occupied Tibet. Since 1959, the Chinese have built an extensive road network along the Tibetan border and, more recently, in the part of northeastern Kashmir given to China by Pakistan. In the 1962 border rumble with China, the unprepared and underequipped Indian Army suffered a humiliating defeat that still rankles in the minds of soldier and civilian alike. The brief, bloody struggles in the high Himalayas had two consequences, one that still endures, the other, shortlived: India began to take a more realistic view of its position *vis-à-vis* China in Asia, and for a few months, religious, language, and regional differences were put aside, as all the people pulled together to defend their country. Observers in New Delhi joked that "if the war had only lasted a bit longer, it might have made a nation out of India."

To prepare for possible future battles against Pakistan or China, India has had to divert $1.5 billion of precious funds to defense spending, a shift that quickly made itself felt throughout the economy. Top Indian leaders believe that such diversion was one of the objectives sought by China when it attacked India. The other: to humble India in the eyes of the nonaligned nations, and establish once and for all who is the dominant power in Asia.

The war between India and Pakistan had another, unexpected result for both. The Johnson Administration, alarmed at this misuse of U.S. defense aid and squandering of scarce resources, decided to hold up on aid commitments to the two countries until they quit fighting. That help has now been resumed in part, but the temporary holdup hurt India more than Pakistan.

Within its own borders, India has its hands full with two full-scale revolts by ethnic groups seeking to leave the federal union and sporadic rioting over issues ranging from food to language. In the Mizo Mills of Assam, tribesmen are fighting Indian troops to gain autonomy. In the Nagaland district on the Burmese border, an on-again-off-again revolt of Naga tribesmen demanding an independent Naga state has been punctuated with terrorism, including the bombing of two trains, which took the lives of 95 people. In Bombay, Calcutta, Kerala and Madras, rioters sometimes burn trains, sometimes burn cars and in one paroxysm—over the establishment of a separate Punjabi-speaking state—burned alive three members of the ruling Congress party who were trapped in a Panipat store. Army units and police detachments have battled rioters, with the resulting deaths of at least a score of lawbreakers in Calcutta alone. Despite its championing of the principles of nonviolence, India is no stranger to bloodletting, and some of its domestic disputes spill into the streets, where screaming, rock-throwing mobs take over.

"The world thinks of India as a place of spiritual wealth, as a place of nonviolence," a Bombay editor told me. "Nothing could be further from the truth. The principle of nonviolence was proposed for a very specific purpose by Mahatma Gandhi: to use against the British. Anybody who comes here will see that Indians are not only violent in deed but also in thought. We often argue and debate in violent ways, and some of us carry violence in our words because we do not have the physical resources to carry out violence in deeds! I know the rest of the world thinks of India as a spiritual force, but this is largely a myth. Just as you have your 'ugly Americans,' we also have our 'ugly Indians.' "

This tendency toward violence makes the fuse that much shorter among the country's antagonistic ethnic, linguistic and religious groups. Hindus and bearded Sikhs have fought over the creation of the new state in which the Punjabi-speaking Sikhs will dominate a large Hindu minority. Stirred by leftist provocateurs using food shortages as a pretext, residents of West Bengal have gone on rioting binges. In battles with police and troops, scores have lost their lives, and hundreds more have been injured. The dense and volatile city of Calcutta was brought to its knees twice last spring, when Communists and left-wing labor unions ordered general strikes that the public dared not defy. For a few tense hours, it was evident that neither the central nor the state government was in complete control there.

Sometimes the violence takes a more personal turn. Recently, an enraged member of one of the state parliaments removed his shoes and threw them at the presiding speaker, striking the latter on the head. Brawling legislators had to be ejected from the house.

Present-day India was formed by the British from some 500 princely states into one nation-state. But a dangerous trend has developed. Starting in 1953, successive Indian governments have yielded to demands from religious and linguistic leaders and reorganized a number of states along lines of language. With the recent decision of Mrs. Gandhi's government to create the new Junjab state, each of the country's 14 main languages is now the dominant and official tongue in at least one state. But each of the political concessions has planted a potential land mine in the subcontinent's path toward national unity. Language and religious differences, over which emotions can blaze in India, have intensified. Loyalty to one's state (and hence to one's own linguistic group) tends to shoulder aside allegiance to the nation. Even in the midst of the country's most desperate food crisis, this tendency appears. While schoolchildren in Italy and the Netherlands go without lunches to donate money for India's famished masses, its own surplus-food states have sometimes been unwilling to share their excess grain with neighbors whose inhabitants were starving.

Perhaps the strongest challenge is that posed by India's states, preoccupied with their individual woes, to the national solutions that have been worked out by India's central government. Food rationing, for example, is being pushed by the central government in New Delhi, but is being mired in the states, which carry out rationing through indifferent and inefficient bureaucracies.

The central government declared a state of emergency at the time of the Chinese invasion in 1962 and invoked a form of martial law called DIR (the Defense of India Rules). It is still in effect but is used now principally as a weapon to curb violence and internal strife. Under DIR, a number of civil rights have been suspended, including free speech, free assembly and the right of appeal to the courts for those arrested. Thousands have been imprisoned, among them state legislators and dissidents ranging from Communists through troublesome opposition members to right-wing extremists. The frequent use of DIR has disturbed wide sections of Indian opinion. But the Delhi administration, confronted with revolts like those of the Mizo and Naga tribesman (which the government believes are aided by the Pakistanis and the Chinese), has refused to end DIR. In the meantime, critics speak out at their own peril.

Aside from communal and other stresses—and these are big asides—India is also suffering from severe economic strain. The nation is critically short of foreign exchange with which it might recharge its lagging industry and galvanize its agriculture. Inflation is surging, and unemployment is also rising.

But it may be that India's march to progress will be quickened because a lady changed her mind. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, who took office lukewarm to the idea of granting foreign firms an entry into India's chemical-fertilizer market, has now said yes. It was a key decision, for most experts agree that a massive fueling of chemical fertilizer is the booster that Indian agriculture needs to leap from its launching pad. Indian farmers plant 320 million acres annually—about the same amount as U.S. farmers—but their return is only about 40 percent of the yield obtained by their American counterparts. And India's population is 2½ times ours. Indian farmers use only about one-thirteenth as much fertilizer per acre as Americans. Agricultural experts agree that they could quadruple or quintuple their harvests with enough chemical fertilizers. With the Gandhi cabinet's decision to relax restrictions on private fertilizer production, the Indian Government hopes thereby to lift output from the present 400,000 tons a year to 2,500,000 by 1970.

The fertilizer deal, like the Johnson Administration's proposal to channel $300 million of the hoard of rupees accumulated by the U.S. from the sale of food aid into an Indo-American educational foundation, is suspect to many Indians. In a country wedded to the idea of state dominance over key sectors of the economy, many Indians fear that giant foreign firms will improperly exploit the Indian market. Similarly, critics see the joint educational foundation as a Trojan horse for the CIA at worst, and an unwarranted American interference in Indian educational policies at best.

These are but the latest rubs in the U.S.'s sometimes chafing relationship with India. India is tied to the U.S. by bonds that both succor and constrict. We are far more important to India than its pride or politics can often tolerate. Of the $10 billion India has received in aid from other countries since 1951, the U.S. has furnished 58 percent. The mountain of amassed rupees held by the U.S., $2.5 billion, is over 20 percent of India's currency. Even in relatively good food-production years, India must still count upon large grants of American grain to feed its hungry half-billion people. When President Johnson held up on U.S. aid to India and Pakistan during last year's short war, India's economy was dealt a severe blow. An Indian columnist voiced a widespread feeling when he wrote: "Economic planning which gets completely disrupted by the withholding of assistance by one country cannot be regarded as 'sound.'"

If Indians are irritated by their dependence on America and angered by those who point out their shortcomings, Americans are often equally irritated by the Indians' querulous ways and what seems like an inability to assault problems with the energy they demand. In the face of what the Indians themselves describe as their worst calamity in 70 years, the bumbling pace of government bureaus is perplexing to the outsider. Even harder to understand is the corruption that rots some offices. As the Indian Express complained: "Of the several tricks employed by the Government employee, the one with which the common man is most familiar is the one of being forced to wait on him day after day to get his business done until he breaks down and is psychologically prepared to comply with the official's unspoken demand." Though the Gandhi government has declared war on corruption, the practice is deep-seated and will be difficult to cut out.

American policy makers feel that while India has made promising advances in its short life as a nation, it must work even harder in the future if it is to move out of the shadow of famine and into the light of self-sufficiency. The agreement to permit foreign firms to start fertilizer production will be a big leap in that direction. A step-up in the birth-control program will be another. Economic and administrative reforms are also needed to streamline India's Kafkaesque bureaucracy. But Western experts who have worked and lived in India for years believe the scent of change is in the air and that the next decade may be India's time of rebirth. The edge of the custom curtain is beginning to lift. But what kind of spectacle it will reveal is something even the seers cannot foretell.

IN 19 YEARS, INDIA HAS ROLLED UP SOME SOLID ADVANCES

Most foreigners who visit India come away shaking their heads. But foreigners have been shaking their heads for 19 years. In that time, India has rolled up some solid advances. Its industrial production has grown at the remarkable rate of about nine percent a year, and almost 80 percent of its total investment has been financed by internal savings. Electrical power has tripled since 1951, road mileage has doubled. Striking hard at disease, India has increased the supply of physicans by half and doubled the number of hospital beds. Malaria has now been virtually eliminated. The nation is also making substantial progress in education: Although illiteracy is still up at the 80-percent level, school enrollment has jumped to three times what it was in 1951.

India struggles to move ahead even as the waves of over-population threaten to wash away these hard-won accomplishments. As a start, the government is putting $50 million a year into its birth-control program, and thousands of clinics around the country are handling the lengthening lines of those who wish contraceptive aid. A government plant is turning out 15,000 plastic intrauterine loops a day to help in the fight. Employers like Sudhir Thackersey of the Bombay textile family have installed surgeries where male workers can get a free vasectomy (tying the sperm duct) and are paid during recuperation.

In Punjab state, 27,000 of these operations were performed in 1965, more than the total of those performed in the previous ten years. In Bombay, the birthrate has already come down to 28 per thousand, 12 points below India's average.

As India works to overcome internal problems, there is always the danger that another war may further cripple its painful progress. The truce concluded between the late Prime Minister Shastri and Pakistan's President Ayub Khan in Soviet Tashkent, under Russian prodding, has been eroding ever since. Pakistan has acquired a few Chinese tanks and jet fighters; its top officials have been making increasingly belligerent speeches aimed at New Delhi, and each side has accused the other of treaty violations. Indian leaders fear that Pakistan, egged on by China, which seeks to embarrass Russia, may risk some new military adventure. Moreover, each detonation of a Chinese nuclear device sends tremors reverberating through the Indian political scene. So far, Mrs. Gandhi has refused to yield to the clamor within her own party that calls for an Indian A-bomb. Experts concede that India, which is building one of the world's largest nuclear-power stations, has sufficient nuclear know-how to turn the trick. But an Indian bomb would mean more precious resources diverted.

India, the world's largest democracy, is being challenged to prove that its leap into self-sufficiency can be achieved without the resort to totalitarian discipline used by Asia's other two giants, the U.S.S.R. and China. The rest of the underdeveloped world is watching anxiously from the sidelines.

"South Louisiana Hayride," With Its Deep South Western Music of Ponchatoula, La., Threatens to Outdo Nashville, Tenn.—Home of "Grand Old Opry"—It Has Many Rabid Fans, Famous Stars, and Abounds With Colorful Entertainment Every Saturday Night

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, it used to be that you would have to go to Nashville, Tenn., on a Saturday night to see and hear good old country western music played by famous artists who come from far and wide to join together each week for the famous "Grand Ole Opry" show.

But this Tennessee monopoly is about to be challenged by one of the best western Saturday night performances in the Deep South, and people come from miles around, from anywhere and almost everywhere to see Ponchatoula's pride and joy, the "South Louisiana Hayride."

Unlike the famous stage show—namely, "Louisiana Hayride," which many years ago was a Broadway hit, starring Carol Bruce and other celebrities, south Louisiana's "Hayride" could almost be considered a distant cousin of a stage show musical comedy which ran for years on Broadway and across the Nation. "South Louisiana Hayride" is not a nightly production of the same show, but a brandnew one, every Saturday night, that packs them in with standing room only, to bring fame and widespread publicity to the colorful little city of Ponchatoula with its famous and even fabulous western music.

Ponchatoula used to boast it was the "Cypress Capital of the World" with two giant cypress sawmills, one owned by the husband of a famous yesteryear movie star, Marguerite Clark, which have long since disappeared. But, today some people call it the "Little Athletic Capital of the United States," with championship American Legion baseball teams and tournaments and championship semipro baseball teams. And in the spring of the year you can always get a big dish of the finest strawberries in the whole wide world.

When famous western music stars arrive in Ponchatoula for this 8 o'clock hayride every Saturday night, things really begin to happen. Mothers and fathers, sons and daughters, come from every direction, both near and far, and come early to try to get a seat.

This hayride western show happened, almost by coincidence, because Stanley Cowen wondered why our people of this area could not have a fine, clean show each week to entertain them after a week of hard work. His father, M. A. Cowen, affectionately known as "Dunk," said:

> Son, you are right—if you do it right with good western music and fix it so that any man would be as glad to see his daughter there, as in a church, you cannot miss, and I will back you all the way.

That is just what happened and even those few critics who said it might last 6 months have joined in applauding all the fame that the south Louisiana hayride has been bringing to this countryside ever since it started in February of 1964.

Working with Stanley Cowen was a western music stalwart named Lloyd "Hank" Jones, who not only has a thriving insurance business, but carries on a little politics along the way, holding an important elected office as police juryman for the seventh ward of Tangipahoa Parish.

Every Saturday night, at about 8 o'clock as the crowds pull in, those who cannot get a prize seat just stay home and turn on the popular radio station, WFPR, that has a listening audience of well over 100,000 folks, and with the talented aid of "Rube" Rogers, known far and wide as the original "Country Boy," Terrel McCrory and George Holly, all of the neighboring city of Hammond, the show is brought by this radio station, to all the armchair fans who sit at home listening to Rube opening up:

> Get comfortable, just take off your shoes, you'll feel better, get the coffee poured around 'cause here comes the show you have been waiting for.

And with big time flare on comes one of the most unusual and entertaining western shows to the delight of thousands who take their hillbilly and western music so seriously. Many will drive miles to hear their favorite stars.

RCA Victor thought so much of this Ponchatoula Hayride talent that they sent in to Ponchatoula over a million dollars worth of recording equipment to make the Porter Wagoner album, entitled "Porter Wagoner on the Road," with other favorite stars Norma Jean and "Speck" Rhodes participating. Few, if any western music stars enjoy the popularity of Porter Wagoner. This very album made at the Ponchatoula Hayride is near top spot in the Nation's ratings of like albums. With Porter Wagoner and other stars, this show has attained worldwide publicity, while the loyal folks of Ponchatoula, with a twinkle in their eye, will usually say "whether it's western music with Porter Wagoner at our South Louisiana Hayride or a championship American Legion baseball team, or a championship high school football team, Ponchatoula always brings home the 'bacon.'"

And on any Saturday night, it is not uncommon to see people from as far away as Florida or California or even see Louisiana's most successful and popular Gov. John J. McKeithen with his family sitting right there in the front row, or a U.S. Congressman, or a visiting U.S. Senator—they all come, and sometimes as many as 2,000 or 3,000 at a time to see their favorite, the "family fun show," with folks of all ages from 2 to 92. Some doubted it all could happen, but thanks to Stanley Cowen, his fine father, "Dunk," Hank Jones, Country Boy Rube Rogers, George Holly and others, it did happen. And the only thing that worries the people of Ponchatoula is that many might start calling their show, the "little grand ole opry" of the Deep South and that would be terrible, because they, are so proud, that they never want to change the name of the South Louisiana Hayride which they love so dearly.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Bankers Back Student Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important resources of our Nation is its educational system. With modern technology the importance of excellence in education continues to mount. Unfortunately for most families the cost of higher learning, like most other goods and services, has increased—up 50 percent in the last 10 years. A principal source of financing higher education are public and private guaranteed loans. America's banks have long participated in the plan and now they have pledged full support of the college loan program to provide adequate finances for students desiring to complete their education.

Dr. Benjamin Fine, education editor of the Bell McClure Syndicate, recently wrote an informative article on "Bankers Back Student Aid." I have unanimous consent that his column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

COLLEGE FOR THE ASKING: BANKERS BACK STUDENT AID

(By Benjamin Fine, Ph. D.)

The top management of the nation's largest banks, members of the Association of Reserve City Bankers, have pledged their full support to finance student loans under state and private guarantee plans.

The bankers plan to develop methods and procedures to provide adequate amounts of funds in all sections of the country. An estimated 775,000 college students will be eligible to borrow $620 million during the next school year to finance their education.

According to Charles E. Walker, executive vice president of the American Bankers Association, all banks will eventually participate in the program. He predicted that students will borrow primarily in their home towns rather than in their college towns.

The federal government is the principle source of college loans. More than $190 million a year is loaned to some 250,000 students. But the federal government wants private and state agencies to take over this job, though the government will continue to underwrite the loans and subsidize the interest rate. Thus, if the banks charge the students 6 percent interest, the federal government will pay 3 percent and the student will pay the other 3 percent.

As the importance of education continues to mount, so does the cost of obtaining a higher education. The cost of financing a higher education at either a public or private school has increased by 50 percent in the last 10 years and will jump another 25 percent by 1970. Enrollments are climbing along with costs. The number of students in college doubled between 1955 and 1965, going to 5.5 million. By 1970 enrollments will reach 8 million.

AGREEMENTS SIGNED

Interim agreements to initiate the insured student loan program during the upcoming academic year have been signed by the U.S. Office of Education with agencies in 13 states and the United Student Aid Funds which operates a nationwide student loan program. The United Student Aid Funds, 5259 N. Tacoma Ave., Indianapolis, Ind., is a nonprofit student guaranteed loan agency with programs in all 50 states.

The USFA guarantees the loans, reimburses the banks and continues the collection procedure if the loans become delinquent. The loans, of course, are supplemented with scholarships, fellowships and outright grants from private, federal and state sources.

Under the government-guaranteed loan program the government assists state and private student loan insurance plans in underwriting loans up to $1,000 a year for undergraduate students and $1,500 for graduate students.

I have prepared a series of bulletins that spell out the sources available for scholarships, fellowships and loans and the steps to follow in getting college funds. Write to Dr. Benjamin Fine, in care of The Star, and ask for these bulletins; Bulletin No. 1, "College Help for Children of Veterans"; Bulletin No. 2, "Where To Get Federal, State and Private Loans"; Bulletin No. 3, "Major Scholarship Sources"; Bulletin No. 5, "Scholarships Available Through Business and Industry" and Bulletin No. 10, "Federal Scholarships, Fellowships and Loans." Please send a long, stamped, self-addressed envelope and 25 cents in coin for each bulletin desired to cover handling charges. (All five for $1.)

One of the major sources of scholarship aid are the colleges themselves. During the coming year the colleges are scheduled to offer $100 million in scholarship aid to 300,000 students. Not everyone who applies gets help, of course. But two important considerations are involved: academic record and need.

YALE EXAMPLE

Yale University is a good example. At present the total financial assistance received by the four Yale classes amounts to $3 million each year. A request for financial aid will in no way handicap an application. This is generally true among all colleges.

Financial aid, in accordance with need, will be continued all four years, provided only that the student remains in good academic and personal standing. Jobs will normally be offered but are not mandatory. Yale loans may always be substituted for the job. Every effort is being made by Yale to find on-campus jobs when requested. More than 40 percent of each recent class of Yale has received financial aid.

You can get a listing of the scholarships, loans and jobs available at each college and university in the United States from the 360-page U.S. Office of Education book "Financial Assistant for College Students: Undergraduate." (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, $1.25.)

For those interested in graphic arts, the Educational Council of the Graphic Arts Industry, 1411 K St. NW, Washington, has set up a national scholarship trust fund for 12 fourth-year scholarships to be used at institutions offering degree programs or majors in printing design, printing teaching, printing management and technology. The values of the scholarships range from $100 to $1,000 a year. Additional scholarships are offered by several companies, foundations and other donors in the industry.

Proposed Alteration of U.S. Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Martin Nolan, the Washington reporter from the Boston Globe, has written a very perceptive article concerning the reconstruction and relocation of the west front of this historic building. This is a subject that needs very careful and thoughtful study by the experts and those who have an interest in maintaining our Capitol as an example of our national heritage.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Nolan's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS OUR CAPITOL A NATIONAL SHRINE OR JUST ANOTHER OFFICE BUILDING?—ALTERATIONS PLANNED; ARCHITECTS BATTLE

(By Martin F. Nolan)

When Major Charles Pierre L'Enfant was ordered by George Washington to find a suitable place for the new national Capitol Building, he chose Jenkins' Hill near the Potomac, calling it "a pedestal waiting for a monument."

And a monument it has become, resting on the 88-foot hill, its gleaming white dome surmounting older portions of the building as a familiar symbol of the work of government.

The Capitol Building, which has survived fire, explosion, neglect and a hundred fads in architecture, is now faced with being mummified by its current caretakers.

The architect of the Capitol, J. George Stewart, plans to extend the west front of the Capitol, "fill in" its recesses and courtyards and wall up the result in marble. This plan will make the Caiptol harmonize with its new neighbor, the three-block-long Rayburn House Office Building, also a Stewart product.

Stewart, a 75-year-old former congressman from Delaware, is the eighth Architect of the Capitol. He is not, however, an architect, but an engineer. Stewart's talents also lie in the field of public relations. In 1958, he convinced Congress to spend $24 million to extend the east front, the ostensible reason being the need for more office space and the architectural necessity of correcting an "overhanging" dome.

The east front, the more famous because of presidential inaugurations, was extended 32 feet, its sandstone finish replaced with marble, thus requiring morning visitors to wear sunglasses when scaling its steps. The aesthetic change supposedly means better balance for the building, although one architect wrote at the time that "no one actually sees that the skirt (of the dome) appears to rest on the portico unless he is hovering above the structure in a helicopter."

A more compelling reason for the east front extension is given in an official guide to the Capitol, "We, the People," sold to tourists in the building's lobby:

"The Capitol gained 2½ acres of space spread over five floors. Brought into being were 102 rooms, including individual offices, committee and reception rooms, dining rooms, kitchens and entrance foyers."

Current plans for extending the west front involve 4½ acres of new office space. If the pattern of past expansion holds true, much of the new space will go to private offices held by senators. Some 30 senators enjoy the use of these hideaways, all of the room entrances unmarked and their locations unrecorded in Capitol floor plans found in the Congressional Directory. About half of these offices were created by the east front extension.

Senators who have such rooms use them for speech-writing or relaxing. Each senator, of course, is given another large suite of offices in one of two Senate office buildings a half-block away.

New office space in the expanded west front would mean shorter walks or subway rides for some of the most powerful men in Congress. The new offices would also look out on the most imposing view in Washington—down the mall to the Washington Monument and Lincoln Memorial and down Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House.

These architectural circumstances perhaps explain why only one congressman fought the $240,000 appropriation last year to let Stewart study the west front and come up with recommendations. Cong. SAMUEL S. STRATTON (D–N.Y.), who represents eight counties of New York State farmland, addressed himself last Oct. 14 to Stewart's main argument for extending the west front, i.e., that the Capitol is slowly collapsing.

"O, I will be told that the present sandstone walls are crumbling," STRATTON said. "Of course they are. I have seen them. They need to be shored up and strengthened. And I have seen the engineering report which says that the only way you can save these walls is to cover them up. But engineering reports are like lawyers' briefs. You can get them to prove either side you want; you get what you pay for.

"I just do not believe that this great nation, so technically advanced that we can orbit two men for eight days in space, cannot find it possible to preserve the west front of the Capitol without destroying its historic integrity."

STRATTON'S point of preservation has been backed by Wolf von Eckardt, architectural critic for the Washington Post and the New Republic:

"It is ludicrous to pretend that there are insurmountable difficulties in shoring up a few arches and replacing a few stones. It has been done on far older buildings, such as Hagia Sophia (in Istanbul) and St. Paul's Cathedral (in London)."

"If the west front now needs restoration," says Von Eckardt, "let it be restored as hundreds of old buildings have been restored."

The American Institute of Architects here, representing 21,000 architects, has officially opposed the west front expansion, saying that "if the Capitol continues to expand, it will rapidly lose all resemblance to the original building. The A.I.A. believes that it should be a permanent policy of the Congress that the exterior of the Capitol remain unchanged."

Stewart has already disregarded this advice by erecting huge timber braces against the columns of the west front, as well as massive buttresses at the building's base. He ordered this work done last Fall after engineers testified that stones might fall out, causing a partial collapse of the building.

The engineers testified before a commission called—for the benefit of doubting Thomases—"The Commission for the Extension of the United States Capitol." The commission carries a little bit of political weight around town. Besides Stewart, its members are HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN and GERALD R. FORD.

The commission's hearing last June 24 established only the need for study funds, not money to begin building again. Although the study is virtually complete after almost a year, Stewart's office refuses to talk about it, saying only that the study is "very complete" and will be released "soon."

An article in the April issue of the A.I.A. Journal outlines three alternatives open to the commission. One would preserve the walls as they are now, another would extend the west front a la the east front expansion and the third would redesign the building "in a basically different manner some distance from the present walls."

The author of the article, Francis D. Lethbridge, a Washington architect, states flatly that "it is the third alternative which is being carried forward at the present time by the Architect of the Capitol." This tack will result, says Lethbridge, in the Capitol's becoming "a shapeless mass signifying nothing but its own bulk."

Architectural opinion on the west front is not universal. Paul Thiry of Seattle, a member of the National Capitol Planning Commission, supports the call for more office space and meeting rooms, stressing that the expansion can preserve the Capitol's original appearance if not its exact form.

The hassle over the project will surely be delayed by the Viet Nam war's effect on the budget. Since Stewart has estimated the cost of the west front expansion as between $24 and $31 million, Congress and the President will be most reluctant to approve such a sum. Republican critics, after all, almost torpedoed $750,000 for a house for vice presidents. Cong. JAMES C. CLEVELAND (R-N.H.) called it "a frill upon a hill," a description that may come back to haunt congressmen who voted with Cleveland against "the V.P. teepee" if they want to enlarge their own wigwam.

The argument of historic preservation and continuity may prove to be the telling blow against the new west front, if indeed it is stopped. As Cong. STRATTON said last Fall, "this country went to great expense to preserve the original walls of the White House when reconstruction was undertaken in 1948. I believe we should do no less in the case of the U.S. Capitol . . . I oppose this extension because if it goes through it means that the last remaining exterior facade of the original Capitol Building, dating back to 1800, will be forever covered from view. We fight to preserve our historic shrines and buildings, not cover them up with garish imitations."

Honorary Degree for Bill Springer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Lincoln College in Illinois on Sunday, June 12, conferred the honorary degree of doctor of laws on our good friend and colleague, BILL SPRINGER. This was the second time that the gentleman from Illinois has been so honored by an institution of higher learning in his district. In 1953 he received an honorary degree from Milliken University in Decatur.

This time he really had to work for his degree. Lincoln College assigned him no easy task. It called on Congressman SPRINGER to deliver the commencement address, on the college's 101st anniversary, as a substitute for the Senate minority leader, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, one of the great orators of our time. Senator DIRKSEN'S recent hip injury forced him to cancel his scheduled commencement address at Lincoln College.

Congressman SPRINGER handled this difficult assignment with the same good humored deftness we are accustomed to seeing him display as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. His speech at Lincoln College shows wit and erudition. I include it here so that all of my colleagues can read and enjoy it:

I am here as your speaker today because Ev DIRKSEN fell out of bed.

I understand you were to be privileged to hear that great personality on this occasion had it not been for his accident. Please do not expect me to emulate his style or his appearance. Try as I will my hair will not stick out like that. It has been suggested that the Senator carries batteries in his pockets to keep that effect, but I think the insinuation is fallacious and shocking.

It is an honor to be considered worthy to fill in for the sage of the Senate, and I am sure that years hence when asked who delivered the commencement address at your college you will unhesitatingly reply, "Some congressman substituting for Senator DIRKSEN." Such is the price of popularity. You can be assured that the Senator would much rather be with you today, hip intact and bon mots at the ready.

Over the years I have had occasion to observe many commencement exercises—not too often as a participant, I hasten to explain, but as a speaker and as a proud parent eagerly awaiting the thrilling end to a four year financial disaster. Without doing any research in depth on the subject, I have observed that most commencement speakers tend to reminisce and bore you stiff with stories about the good old days. You should be very pleased to know that I shall be no exception to the rule. I would not want to break old traditions and have the ivy fall off the walls from surprise.

But I will keep in mind that the "hard times of today" are what we later on refer to as the "good old days." Having gone to college in the depths of the "Great Depression," which at the time was a description of an economic condition and not a psychiatrist's term, I recall meeting an old college crony in his cups who wisfully described those happy, carefree college days when we had no worry in the world—except the haunting fear that we might starve to death.

But as we old duffers recall the day of the five cent hamburger, I cannot help but ponder how it will sound in years to come when you, as the old crocks who make the speeches, turn on the nostalgia and tell about the days when—

A hamburger only cost thirty-five cents and the catsup was free.

You could buy a reasonably good suit for as little as ninety dollars.

Some working men were able to subsist on about one hundred fifty dollars a week.

There was a little coin called a dime that was made out of silver.

Young people were much better behaved.

When you are young, any kind of days are good days if you will just let them be so.

Another thing the commencement speaker is famous for, according to my little personal research project (which was turned down for a grant by NIH), is that invariably he has some pet philosophy which he has expounded ad nauseum to his children for the last quarter century. The general reception in that forum is always PHFFT. But now he has a whole new group to try it out on. Best of all, he has them in a position where they must listen politely and even applaud. What rapture. He can now hold up his head at home. And that is why it is not difficult to recruit commencement speakers.

So, in this instance also, I will do my best to live up to the commencement speaker's code. I have a philosophy which meets all the specifications, and I shall proceed to expound it, so brace yourself.

Let us talk for a moment about an old and overused word—Security. We can look at it from various points of view and in several of its ramifications to see whether or not it deserves the awe in which it seems to be held.

First, there is that elusive but apparently demanding thing called "national security." At times the country seems to be obsessed with it, whatever it may be. We find that nearly everything we do has some bearing on that nebulous thing—national security. We keep stockpiles of materials in its name. We probe space in its name. We spend over half of our staggering national budget for its most apparent aspect, military preparedness. We support other nations and international agreements and even international armed forces in its name.

At the same time we make it known privately and publicly that the United States is so strong and so resolute that all other nations really exist by our permission. We can, if necessary, says the gospel, annihilate any nation or group of nations which seriously threatens our existence. Probably so. But if so, what are we so worried about all the time?

Back in the beginning of our country, talk about national security must have been a kind of joke. We were a shaky little ruht of a nation with practically no military might and economically always struggling to beat our checks to the bank. Perhaps, we didn't really win our independence so much as we fell into it by reason of bungling in Britain and big troubles on the continent. But one thing is for sure—while the struggle was on, the word security could have been taken out of the dictionary and not been missed. There was no such animal.

Where along the line then did we achieve this thing called national security? Not certainly by the War of 1812 when our disgruntled parent came over to teach us a lesson or two. Her troops roamed around and inflicted damage at will. The biggest mistake they made was to choose to burn up the most worthless piece of real property in the country at the time—the Capitol in Washington. Other problems brewing among stronger nations saved our bacon. We survived, but you could hardly describe the situation either before or after as national security.

When, then? By 1860? At that time we found out for sure that local squabbles are far more important to people than national security. There could be no swifter way to lay ourselves helpless before the world than to bleed the nation white by internal dissension and bloody fratricide. The War of the Roses had taught us nothing.

Again we were lucky. No one needed, or knew what to do with an unruly colony at the moment. It would have been like adopting Peck's Bad Boy. So they left us pretty much alone to bleed ourselves to death. And we tried hard enough. Did we then or soon thereafter have anything which might by any definition be called national security? I think not.

Once in our history we thought we had finally achieved national security. After World War I everyone was determined that we would never again be caught up in the wars of others. And we thought we knew how to accomplish it as well. It was simple—destroy everything needed to fight with and tell the remainder of the world we simply were not interested in their problems. If that was national security, I hope we don't have any again soon.

By 1941 we were wondering "What Happened". The Japanese were fixing to gobble up the Pacific including anything we had or might want out there. Europe was disappearing down the Nazi craw, and Hitler's disciples were making alarming inroads in South America. If security means being all alone in the world looking out at a ring of wolves, we had achieved it. Many a long year went by before we could breathe easier and see the tide turn. Fighting men on the bleak islands of the Pacific in 1944 saw no easy road home as they chanted "Golden Gate by '48."

Reminding you of the history since World War II with its cold war, its brinkmanship, the dark cloud of "the bomb," it should not surprise you to find that I think this thing known as national security is a myth. No one ever had it and no one ever will. What we like to think of as national security is a continuing gamble with history based on a series of hunches known as National Security Estimates.

There should be no expectation that we will win them all, but it might be nice to stop playing with the other guy's dice now and then. We should be as confident these days as we were smug before World War II and remember the story of the Russian school boy who was being interrogated by the visiting commissar.

"What do you know about the United States, Ivan?" asked his Honor. "Sir, Commissar," said Ivan, "the United States is a bloated, rich, evil, capitalist nation which wants to dominate the world. It feeds on its poor, downtrodden people who are illiterate and stupid."

"Fine, fine," said the pleased Commissar. "Now tell us what you know about the aims of the Glorious Peoples Republic."

"The aims of the Peoples Republic," recited Ivan, "are to catch up with the United States."

These are uncertain and perilous times in the history of man. That speech could also have been made when the sabre toothed tiger roamed these parts. All times are uncertain—uncertain for nations and uncertain for individuals. An observation on this point was well put by Admiral Radford when he said: "Freedom is not something we inherit by the accident of being born Americans. Each generation must earn it for itself."

So let us examine the idea of personal security for a bit, remembering that in this vale of tears we have no assurance from anywhere that we will get home for dinner tonight. Certain elements among our youth proclaim loudly that they cannot conform to ordinary standards because this generation left them with such tough problems to solve. So they choose to ignore them in the hope that they will go away. Even if their assumption were correct—that we did just purposely unload horrendous problems on them out of pure meanness—they spite only themselves and succeeding generations if they refuse to tackle what we bumblers may have messed up.

It is popular to look backwards at an idyllic age when life was more secure. There comes to mind an image of a rosy cheeked boy in knickers, wearing a cloth cap and rolling a hoop down a quiet, shady street. At the same time, father wore a high celluloid collar which would surely melt under the rigors of a Watusi. This generation, it could be argued, had that thing called security. The country seemed to be entirely safe economically and diplomatically. So little Rollo could look forward to taking over father's business and living in quiet luxury and respectability to a ripe old age.

So Rollo went to Yale and lived with the Bulldog for four years, meeting some of the best people. From them he learned that the best way to make it go forever and ever was to get into stocks and bonds. So this Yale graduate went on to Wall Street and sold bonds. Such was the temper of the times that in due course he had acquired those trappings of security which we all recognize. He had a seat on the Exchange, a home on Long Island and a yacht on the Sound, to say nothing of shares and shares and shares of the best corporations. And then one day something impossible happened. The market went "Boom." He looked around at all his security and found that it had vanished. All he had in the world was a degree from Yale which had long since withered for lack of use. So he opened his window and went to the pavement clutching in his hands some pieces of paper called securities.

This story to you sounds strange, but it happened more times than you would like to know about. It happened in many different ways, in every generation, and it can only lead to a conclusion that security for the individual is also something of a myth. It is, at least, if we think of it in terms of safety from the buffeting of the world—if we think of it in terms of insulation from material worries. All of the high powered social programs designed to insure security, at least late in life—life insurance, social security benefits, medicare—are useful but no guarantee of anything.

If we must define security, I think we would have to compare it more with religion. It comes from within. It is there as long as you believe and know it is there and also do the things your intellect tells you must be done in its name. If you do not doubt it, you have it.

A friend of mine once told me that he had received his inheritance at age 18. He said that was when his father, a lawyer, told him never to expect any property or money to come to him from his, the father's death. "First of all," he said, "there would probably be none anyway because I would use it as I go along. And if I tried desperately to leave an estate for you, it could be wiped out overnight, and the effort would be wasted. One thing I can and will give you and now, so make the most of it. You can have any kind of an education you wish to work for. I will ask no questions as to how long or how expensive. This inheritance, properly managed, will bring you more security than any property I might be in a position to hand on down to you. It is a property which is not perishable or subject to the fluctuations of the market. It can adjust to any circumstances and be used to take care of you and all those you love. It can also be the source of the greatest satisfactions in life." And so it was. Now I doubt that the son was so overwhelmed with this magnanimity that he fell down and kissed his father's feet. I can imagine what his inner reactions might have been. But today he would agree with his father's thinking.

Now that you know my philosophy on the importance of education and the relative unimportance of more material attributes of society you can also understand why over the years I have been in Congress I have supported most of the measures which would make more educational facilities available and make it possible for more of our qualified youth to attend college. A combination of factors has dictated such a course for the government. The large population bulge in college age people has created an acute shortage of physical facilities in which education can take place. The recognition of the national need for scientists and all other advanced skills pointed to government participation.

It started with Sputnik. Suddenly there was a great urgency to train scientists. Great emphasis—probably too much—was concentrated on facilities and courses to produce graduates equipped to speed up our space age image. The concept was too narrow and motivated by misplaced concern, but it did point up a problem.

Trying to solve what at first appeared as a limited problem, the nation was brought face to face with the realization that the need for well educated citizens was far broader. We could not produce high powered scientists by suddenly making the field attractive if we did not build an educational base in the lower grades and secondary schools. To do this required a new breed of teacher and instructor. That in turn required new emphasis on educational courses for aspiring teachers and retreading for those already working at it. To launch a satellite into space and go on from there takes more than a new crop of Werner Von Brauns. Behind every countdown is an immense background of scientific work in many related fields from basic research on matter itself through medical research to engineering.

As these truths gradually dawned upon us we saw evidence of new dedication and new direction in all of education. The National Defense Education Act was expanded greatly to include what might look like extraneous curricula at first blush. That was proper.

My own activity in that regard has been concentrated somewhat in the field of health professions education because the main committee upon which I serve, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, deals directly with them, but the principles hold true throughout the higher education. In the last few years we have made funds availble to build new schools and expand or update schools which will produce doctors, dentists, nurses and other health professionals. There are traineeships for graduates who will strive to qualify as teachers and supervisors in their respective professions. There are loans and now even scholarships to make these professions more available to qualified individuals. At the present time our committee is working on a bill to extend this same kind of help to the supporting professions in the health field such as medical technology and physical therapy. Many new subdivisions of these categories are appearing, and we need to encourage them in the same manner.

I am sure that I would be categorized as a "Progressive conservative" although these pigeon holes mean very little. I have felt for many years and so stated that the best way we could help other countries is to give them technical and educational assistance in such basic matters as health, education and food production. Huge sums sunk into foreign economies seldom pay off. But in the matter of increasing opportunities for our own youth to gain education and make use of its tremendous potential, I see no reason to spare the horses. I said previously security is an attitude, and I think further that it must be based on knowledge. Here is where we insure our national security.

Yes, problems you will have. Some we will leave you and some you will think up by yourselves. The pressures on your generation are terrific. But you also are better equipped to cope with them than any generation so far.

A laundry list of the problems we plan to leave for you would not be comforting either. They range from basic problems like "Is God dead?" to the franchise for a local CATV system. And all of them can give someone ulcers.

By all appearances foreign aid in its present form will still be with you for policy decisions. I have some misgivings about the course this program has taken over the years. How long shall we continue to build up and support countries which refuse political and economic freedom to their own people? It is argued that recipients of our aid must remain neutral in order to retain their self respect. I must confess that it bothers my self respect to have someone help himself to my picnic basket as though he had brought it, eat the best part of the chicken and throw the bones in my face. And when to you with failing hands we throw this hot torch, lots of luck.

And among you here today may be someone who will find himself faced with a duty to make decisions, or at least recommendations about military commitments to other countries. Perhaps you will come forth, as one of my staff assistants did recently when he said, "Congressman, here are four wrong answers—which one do you like?" Shall we help our friends all out? How far should this go? Should we supply only equipment? Should we train troops for other countries? Should we supply our own troops to fight for them? How do we tell who our friends are at any given moment without a scorecard?

I think my point is made. It's an uncertain old world and you are struck with it. So I can only suggest one antidote for the somber and threatening aspects of mankind's future. Don't worry too much about life because you are not going to live through it anyhow. Remember that the world is three-fourths water so the Lord must have intended that we do three times as much fishing as hoeing. About half of life is formalized nonsense which need not impede your progress if you recognize it for what it is and smile at it.

And if the clucking of the old fogies about the younger generation gets on your nerves at times, just remember that every one of them would gladly join you, taking on the burdens you must bear to enjoy the fun you will get out of life in these next few years of work and play. Not pretending to speak for anyone else, I am greatly comforted to realize that the heritage we leave to you is to be in the hands of a new group which is considerably brighter and better prepared for it than my own crowd was thirty-five years ago.

Very Rev. Dr. Vladimir Klodnycky, Bayonne, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on May 1, 1966, the parish of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of St. Sophia in Bayonne, N.J., honored its founding pastor, the Very Reverend Dr. Vladimir Klodnycky, with a testimonial dinner in celebration of his 75th birthday. For his many friends, of whom I am glad to be one, it was a most happy occasion. Dr. Klodnycky has distinguished himself as an administrator, as a scholar, and as a humanitarian in his years of service to his native Ukraine and to the community of Bayonne.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix a translation of a citation presented to Dr. Klodnycky when he was awarded the 1962 Torch of Liberty Award in recognition of his efforts to save the Jewish community of Shmelnyk during the years 1919–20.

There being no objection, the translation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Translation from old Hebrew language made by Prof. P. Koyfman, chief rabbi of the community, city of Chmelnyk, Province of Podollia)

This is a certificate of acknowledgment given to Army Officer Vladimir Stepanovich Klodnycky, born in Galicia who distinguished himself for his great spirit, love of truth, and love for the Jewish people.

In the month of Elul 5679 when the rivers of the Ukraine were overflowing with the blood of innocent people, when thousands and tens of thousands of Jews were killed and cut to pieces for loyalty to their faith, an angel appeared in the county of Lityn in the person of Army Officer Klodnycky. With his talent as a military genius, he saved all the Jews of the area from the sword and looting. Time and again in order to save them, he bravely disregarded danger to his own person from the blood-thirsty peasants. Being a brilliant speaker, he was frequently able to destroy their wicked schemes with his effective speech.

Army Officer Klodnycky was an able negotiator between Christian and Jew, destroying ill will and pacifying the blood-thirsty.

During the year he spent in Chmelnyk, when danger subsided, he showed admirable talent in the field of administration. With great skill he organized hospitals, homes for the aged, took care of the poor and provided bread and firewood for them. He participated in all administrative meetings, civic and Jewish. The suggestions he gave were always full of good sense and wisdom. In short, he was the embodiment of high virtues, which characterize great men. It is to be regretted that this plant, uprooted by war from his native soil, cannot put down its roots in the Ukraine, where brother fights brother and son fights father. His reward is the reward of all great people; he is forced to wander from place to place. This fate may bring him to places where he is unknown. Therefore, I appeal to the Rabbis of all Jewish Communities and to the people in authority in Israel to help Vladimir Klodnycky in every way in case he finds himself in need of engaging in military or civic career.

May God grant that here be many like him among Christians and Jews, then nation will not raise its sword against nation.

Klodnycky highly repects and values the Zionist movement with his whole heart, as a Ukrainian patriot and human being dedicated to righteousness. He often expressed the wish that he might have had the opportunity to help establish a Jewish homeland in their own country.

If the great nations of the world had men like Officer Klodnycky, much would have been ideal in the life of these nations. A man of his caliber should be received with open arms wherever he goes. Because of his qualifications, military and administrative, I would entrust to him the leadership of the sons of Jacob in their pilgrimage to God's mountain. I am sure that leaders of the Jewish movement would entrust to him the guiding of the inspired young pioneer in the realization of their ideals.

A short biography of Army Officer Vladimir Stepanovich Klodnycky: He was born in Galicia in the small town of Chotymyr in the county of Tovmach. The date of his birth is April 2, 1891. In 1918 he completed a course in Juridical Science in Franz Joseph I University in Lviw with diploma number 1293. He also took lectures in political economy. In 1915 he served as officer in the Austro-German Army. In the Ukraine, he had the following positions: Commander of Chmelnyk garrison, Commander of Lityn Brigade, Commander of Second Galician Brigade with the rank of Major.

As I consider this certificate to be of great importance, I attach a picture of said Vladimir Stepanovich Klodnycky. On the back of it is the Talmudic saying, "The righteous of this world will find their reward in the world to come." Also it is written in Isaiah, "And all the peoples of the earth will gather round about him." May God grant him good luck wherever he may go.

Chmelnyk. 1st day of Tamuz, 1850 years after our exile, 680 per shortened Jewish Calendar.

(SEAL)

Chief Rabbi SHALULA BEN JOSEPH LEIB,
From the line of Bilik.

Congressman Grover Reports on New York Congressional District Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results of my annual questionnaire.

This year's poll was prepared and analyzed by the political science students of C. W. Post College under the direction of Dean Alvin C. W. Bahnsen to whom I extend my thanks for a difficult job well done.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

[In percent]

1. Should the United States withdraw from Santo Domingo?

Yes	31.9
No	53.5
No opinion	11.2
No answer	3.4

2. In Viet Nam, which of the following courses do you favor?

(a) Intensify U.S. Military action toward ending the war quickly;

Yes	59.5
No	13.9
No opinion	2.5
No answer	24.1

(b) Increase military aid without American troops; or

Yes	11.7
No	26.8
No opinion	4.2
No answer	57.3

(c) Negotiate best possible peace terms and withdraw?

Yes	35.2
No	20.7
No opinion	10.1
No answer	34.0

3. If the U.N. were to negotiate a compromise settlement in Viet Nam, would you favor United States' acceptance?

Yes	64.7
No	27.8
No opinion	6.6
No answer	.9

4. Should the United States seek an extension of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty by the inclusion of Red China in negotiations?

Yes	54.8
No	37.3
No opinion	5.4
No answer	2.5

5. Do you favor our present policy of admitting Cuban refugees?

Yes	46.4
No	44.1
No opinion	7.9
No answer	1.6

6. Do you favor distributing foreign aid through the United Nations?

Yes	22.2
No	72.4
No opinion	3.8
No answer	1.6

7. Should foreign economic aid be continued and increased providing conditions are placed upon its use?

Yes	51.5
No	42.3
No opinion	3.8
No answer	2.4

8. Should organized groups be allowed to demonstrate for or against Government policies?

Yes	66.1
No	28.6
No opinion	3.3
No answer	2.0

9. Should the Federal Government remove all passport restrictions for citizen travel abroad?

Yes	27.3
No	66.9
No opinion	5.5
No answer	.3

BUDGET AND TAXES

[In percent]

10. Do you feel it is possible for the Federal Government to continue to spend large sums for:

(a) military uses?

Yes	63.3
No	26.3
No opinion	4.0
No answer	6.4

(b) space experimentation?

Yes	58.1
No	31.2
No opinion	4.8
No answer	5.9

(c) social improvements (housing, welfare, health)?

Yes	44.8
No	47.0
No opinion	3.5
No answer	4.7

11. Do you favor the increases in federal excise taxes as recommended by the President?

Yes	30.4
No	60.2
No opinion	7.3
No answer	2.1

12. Do you favor the President's recommendations to increase the withholding tax on income?

Yes	34.1
No	60.5
No opinion	4.1
No answer	1.3

13. Do you favor a national lottery?

Yes	73.1
No	21.6
No opinion	4.5
No answer	.8

LABOR AND BUSINESS

[In percent]

14. Do you favor placing greater federal restrictions on organized labor in public service and utility strikes?

Yes	77.8
No	19.4
No opinion	2.1
No answer	.7

15. Should labor disputes involving companies with national interests be mediated by the Federal Government?

Yes	72.2
No	23.0
No opinion	3.5
No answer	1.3

16. Do you favor a major review of organized labor as it affects our present society, toward the end of establishing a new Labor Relations Act?

Yes	78.9
No	11.1
No opinion	7.1
No answer	2.9

(a) Should federal legislation be passed to eliminate so-called right-to-work laws?

Yes	25.1
No	58.9
No opinion	12.2
No answer	3.8

17. Do you favor a guaranteed annual wage?

Yes	20.5
No	71.3
No opinion	6.5
No answer	1.7

18. Do you favor the establishment of federal standards for business ethics?

Yes	52.8
No	37.5
No opinion	7.3
No answer	2.4

19. Do you favor more strict Federal Government regulations of T.V. and radio advertising?

Yes	55.5
No	39.0
No opinion	4.6
No answer	.9

SPACE

[In percent]

20. Should the United States seek an international agreement on the use of space for military purposes?

Yes	63.7
No	26.5
No opinion	8.0
No answer	1.8

21. Do you believe that our crash program to land a man on the moon is worth the cost of it?

Yes	47.4
No	46.0
No opinion	5.7
No answer	.9

POVERTY

[In percent]

22. Do you think the President's anti-poverty program:

(a) should be expanded?

Yes	20.7
No	53.5
No opinion	5.8
No answer	20.0

(b) already goes too far?

Yes	52.7
No	17.4
No opinion	5.4
No answer	24.5

(c) should be withdrawn?

Yes	39.1
No	26.5
No opinion	7.4
No answer	27.0

23. Should the anti-poverty program be supervised and directed by:

(a) the Federal Government?

Yes	33.1
No	31.8
No opinion	6.1
No answer	29.0

(b) the State Governments?

Yes	23.0
No	35.2
No opinion	6.6
No answer	35.2

(c) the Local Governments?

Yes	33.1
No	33.0
No opinion	6.1
No answer	27.8

24. Should anti-poverty spending by the Federal Government be increased?

Yes	17.0
No	74.3
No opinion	4.2
No answer	4.5

(a) Do you favor Federal rent subsidies to individuals?

Yes	8.3
No	84.5
No opinion	5.2
No answer	1.0

SUBURBAN RENEWAL AND TRANSPORTATION

[In percent]

25. Do you favor Federal Government financial support of the Urban Renewal Program?

Yes	45.1
No	45.2
No opinion	6.8
No answer	2.9

26. Should federal funds be used to meet mass transportation problems:

(a) through loans?

Yes	57.0
No	17.8
No opinion	3.4
No answer	21.8

(b) through outright grants?

Yes	25.2
No	36.4
No opinion	4.5
No answer	33.9

(c) not at all?

Yes	15.9
No	35.2
No opinion	5.6
No answer	43.3

27. Should the Federal Government subsidize the building of inter-state bridges across Long Island Sound?

Yes	59.5
No	33.2
No opinion	6.0
No answer	1.3

FEDERAL POWERS

[In percent]

28. Should there be a Constitutional Amendment limiting the powers of the President in:

(a) domestic affairs?

Yes	28.1
No	38.8
No opinion	3.4
No answer	29.7

(b) foreign affairs?

Yes	29.7
No	35.8
No opinion	4.7
No answer	29.8

(c) both domestic and foreign affairs?

Yes	34.7
No	34.7
No opinion	4.2
No answer	26.4

(d) not at all?

Yes	26.4
No	23.1
No opinion	5.9
No answer	44.6

29. In view of the increased political power being exercised by the Supreme Court, would you favor constitutional changes limiting the term of office for these justices?

Yes	64.0
No	30.1
No opinion	3.6
No answer	2.3

HEATH AND EDUCATION

[In percent]

30. Do you favor federal aid to private and parochial schools:

(a) for school construction?

Yes	37.1
No	57.8
No opinion	1.6
No answer	3.5

(b) for textbooks and teaching materials?

Yes	37.0
No	57.7
No opinion	1.6
No answer	3.7

(c) for teachers salaries?

Yes	29.0
No	63.5
No opinion	3.6
No answer	3.9

31. Do you favor the present federal Medicare program?

Yes	57.0
No	36.0
No opinion	6.1
No answer	.9

REAPPORTIONMENT

[In percent]

32. Do you believe that the apportionment of State Legislatures should be determined by:

(a) the Federal Government?

Yes	19.7
No	39.5
No opinion	5.5
No answer	35.3

(b) State Governments?

Yes	71.4
No	11.5
No opinion	5.6
No answer	11.5

Problems of the National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD the recent address given by the Honorable Howard Jenkins, member of the National Labor Relations Board, pointing out some of the problems which have confronted the Board during 1966:

ADDRESS BY HOWARD JENKINS, JR., MEMBER, NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, WASHINGTON, D.C., AT THE THIRD ANNUAL SEMINAR ON LABOR LAW OF THE ATLANTA LAWYERS FOUNDATION, ATLANTA, GA., JUNE 23, 1966

It is indeed a pleasure for me to come to Atlanta and to participate in this important conference. My colleagues and I have taken part in as many labor law seminars throughout the Nation as time will permit. I'm certain that I express their sentiments as well as my own when I say that the unique character of the labor law seminar contributes immensely not only to the growth of the labor bar and its jurisprudence, but also, and perhaps more importantly, to an increased understanding of problems that are central to our industrial growth.

As we reason together during this retreat from our daily activities, the temptation will be strong to focus on detail and, so far as the NLRB is concerned, on isolated cases. This is a natural tendency of specialists; and, this is an age of specialization, in the industrial relations field no less than in others. As a result we sometimes seem to lose perspective and are inclined to look at problems from the wrong end of the telescope. Thus detail becomes enlarged out of proportion to its importance so distorting the total picture that fundamentally sound positions and important long-range goals are lost or obscured.

In a very real sense, the problems of the industrial community are a reflection in miniature of the problems of our Nation. The socio-economic problems that beset us in the human relations field which are the concern of all Americans are not unlike the socio-economic problems that constitute grist for the industrial relations mill. Underlying both sets of problems are the major political and legal tasks of testing and readjusting doctrine so as to harmonize two fundamental democratic principles, namely: preservation of the rights of the individual and preservation of free democratic institutions.

Upon reflection it should not be surprising to find that neither set of problems can be solved in isolation. Whatever judgments form the base from which doctrine emerges in the one area will also by logic and necessity dictate doctrine in the other. Those of us whose primary concern is with the strengthening and expanding of our economy as well as those of us whose efforts are directed toward elimination of social and economic inequities in the broader sense need clearly to recognize the fact that neither group can achieve its goals, if it disregards the other.

It is not my purpose here today to lecture anyone in terms of what his obligations are or what his rights are. Rather it is to share with you an uneasiness that pervades when we strip the facade of positionalism from the structure of industrial relations. Most observers tend to concentrate on the sharp conflicts and the deeply divisive positions in the labor-management arena.

Not simply to be different, but because of their relative importance, I would focus on the similarities and would draw attention to the parallel objectives shared by management and by organized labor.

At the risk of oversimplification, let us first look at the true fundamentals stripping away the less important facade and protective coloration with which they are surrounded. Management, as a category, descriptive of owners and managers of business organizations, is committed to the development and growth of economically sound, financially profitable business enterprises. Spokesmen for management remind us again and again that such institutions can flourish only if free from governmental intrusion and independent of governmental controls over the internal decision-making processes.

In much the same way, and for many of the same reasons, organized labor espouses the view that if our economy is to be strong and viable, there must exist a strong, independent, free trade union movement composed of autonomous, separate organizations likewise free from governmental intrusion and governmental control of its internal decision-making processes. Both management and labor then approach the industrial relations problems in our economy basically in agreement at least as regards the role properly to be exercised by Government and, more importantly, as regards the necessity that private organizations, be they business or labor, must be privately controlled and their choices dictated by their own self-interest.

Both labor and management taken generically speak as one in espousing the principle that central to sound labor-management relations is employee freedom of choice. There is no ideological dispute between mature spokesmen of unions or employers over whether employees have the right to act in concert or singly as they choose. Perhaps the less sophisticated are even more obviously dedicated to the principle of free employee choice—if one can judge by the campaign materials in representation cases.

We also find evidence that unions and employers, on the whole, are together in acceptance of the view that if a bargaining relationship has been established (voluntarily or involuntarily), the obligation to deal with each other is real.

In like manner, we could describe the basic components of our national labor policy and find little basis for disagreement on the understanding of those basics between lawyers who represent employers and those who represent unions. Perhaps that is why both can work together professionally in a single section of the bar.

Despite these important positives and they are important, two detractions emerge, each of which deserve comment.

First is the fact borne out by the recent compilation and analysis issued by the General Counsel of the NLRB. It appears that the vast majority of his prosecutive time is spent litigating cases in which there is no legal issue whatsoever and in which the factual issues involve questions that have been answered literally thousands of times. Lengthy briefs are still being filed challenging the constitutionality of the statute, questioning the validity of delegations of authority, and raising frivolous matters. Hearings are being burdened with the assertion of defenses conceivably known to be without merit. Procedures designed to assure fair process are utilized to thwart the administrative objectives, not with a view toward prevailing but for the sole purpose of delay.

The second item relates to the dimensions of the case load of the Agency. I will cite no statistics or attempt to overwhelm you with the enormity of the task. I leave that for others who are more directly involved. This audience in its sophistication is well aware that Board Members see only the tip of the iceberg. My concern, however, is as real as though all 30,000 matters which this Agency handled during the current fiscal year came personally before me. The fact to which my concern is directed is the fact that this ever increasing case load is largely in the control of the labor bar. In the past seven years the Agency workload has almost doubled.

The National Labor Relations Board is not a self-initiating operation. Neither the Board nor the General Counsel has the authority to initiate proceedings. Our processes must be invoked. Every unfair labor practice case which this Agency has processed began when some person walked into some office of the Board and filed a charge alleging that the law had been violated. We do not maintain a wide ranging investigative force roaming the countryside to discover who is violating the law. This is not to criticize governmental agencies whose responsibilities require them to do so. It is simply to say that our responsibilities neither contemplate nor permit self-initiated action.

Theoretically, with all of the problems inherent in the system, it should break down. Even as theoretically the democratic process is inefficient and unworkable. It is only because of a third ingredient that these theoretical results do not materialize. That ingredient, for want of a better term, can be denominated the public interest. But for general acceptance of that as a legitimate involvement, the system would not work. Labor unions and employers, each undertaking to exercise traditional rights in their own self-interest, unconcerned with the ideals to which reference was made earlier, could not only render the system unworkable but impair our basic democratic assumptions.

Fortunately most of us accept as reasonable the temporizing influence of the public interest. For those who do not, it must be asserted. This is never an easy task, for it runs counter to the assumption that the public interest will be best served by accepting the free interplay of opposing self-interests. Yet it seems clear from the empirical evidence that societal prohibitions are a consequence of behavior thought by most to be irresponsible or undesirable viewed from a public interest standpoint. It is probable that if early human behavior had not included the commission of murder, theft and the bearing of false witness, only seven Commandments would have issued.

In like manner, if neither employers nor unions had engaged in the practices of interfering with, restraining, coercing, and discriminating against employees, we would have fewer "Thou Shalt Nots" in the federal labor laws.

In these comments I have sought only to open some areas for further development—areas in which the bar has a special concern. If lawyers are to fashion the fabric enabling free institutions as well as free men to function effectively, we must concern ourselves with ends as well as means. Because of the central position of our industrial economy in the whole democratic design, the labor bar occupies an even higher role.

Thus, as I see it, those here who have these important responsibilities of advising and guiding their clients in this area—men, who represent the leadership of the bar, have an unusual opportunity, both professionally and in terms of the social good, while at the same time serving your own clients' enlightened self interest.

What better way to minimize governmental intrusion, what better way to enable reasonable men to settle their differences privately between themselves without governmental intercession, than to lay hold of these problems and thus avoid the "Shalt Nots" being superimposed by an exasperated or wrathful Government.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. WYDLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the right of self-determination and independence for all peoples is a principle firmly engraved in the American character; and it is in pursuit of these principles that the United States has guided her actions. Yet to more than 25 nations in the modern world, these principles of freedom and justice mean only memories and hope. These are the captive nations of Eastern Europe, Asia, and the Caribbean.

It is in sympathy with the unfulfilled aspirations of these gallant people that the President recently designated the week beginning July 17, 1966, as Captive Nations Week. The eighth annual response to a unanimous resolution of the 86th Congress, Captive Nations Week is dedicated to the exhibition of U.S. determination that the status quo of Communist domination should not be recognized as a permanent situation. It is appropriately centered on those nations now engulfed by communism. By strengthening the weapons of truth and fact throughout the United States, the ceremonies and activities of Captive Nations Week will thus contribute to overall American support of the gallant cause of freedom.

Many have recently pointed out the so-called process of "liberalization" that seems to be taking place in a number of Communist satellites; and being a realistic observer of world politics, one must be aware of certain movements in this direction.

However, though he may see some brief hints of progress, an astute observer will, beyond doubt, recognize that these people are not free, nor are they even close to true possession of the freedom with which we of this country are blessed. Witness the Berlin wall; witness the recent rise of religious tension in Poland; witness numerous other instances of totalitarian suppression of ideas and action. Communist oppression has sought, without success, to destroy the existence of national identity in these nations; and the all too gradual improvements have brought virtually no change in the actual status of personal liberty and national independence.

Therefore, in observing Captive Nations Week, we must recognize the plight of these people and pledge our support in their aspiration and struggle. Recognizing their undying spirit, we should extend our sympathy at all times and our aid to the people where it may be practicable in order to negate the unjust denial of their inalienable rights.

President Johnson, in his proclamation of July 8, 1966, has invited the people of the United States of America to observe Captive Nations Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and has urged them "to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty." In addition, it should be our duty and responsibility to put forth every effort enabling the family of captive nations to receive the opportunity to reenter the family of free nations; they should not be thwarted by lack of support and encouragement in their quest for renewed membership in this privileged group.

And, of course, Mr. Speaker, this goes for the people of Russia as well, for those enslaved by communism in the Soviet Union will someday be freemen as they attain their inalienable rights.

Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the continued increase in the cost of living is apparent to the housewife who does the family marketing, the parents who send their children to college, the homebuyer who tries to find a reasonable mortgage, and in fact every American who has to balance his personal budget to purchase the necessities of life. Inflation is not a step around tomorrow's corner, it is walking beside us today.

The demand for money, and its cost as defined by the interest rate, is at a new high—a level not reached in 37 years. Commercial banks have resorted to one of their major tools in combating inflation—an interest rate rise, from 5½ to 5¾ percent. The purpose is to put a brake on spending and an incentive on savings.

The result of this action affects nearly every segment of the economy, especially the important housing and automobile industry which depends on the availability of money and cost of borrowing for sales.

The tragic fact of this situation is that higher interest rates can be laid squarely on the doorstep of the Johnson administration because huge Federal Government spending is a direct cause of the higher cost of borrowing money.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include an article on "Money" from the July 8 issue of Time magazine in the Appendix of the Record:

Money: A Clash of Interest

The cost of money—the most influential cost in the U.S. economy—soared last week to a peak not seen since 1929.

Led by Chemical Bank New York Trust Co., the nation's fifth largest, commercial banks from coast to coast boosted their prime rate—the minimum interest charged for loans to their biggest customers—from 5½% to 5¾%. With unsual speed, major banks in such money centers as New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Boston, Atlanta and Houston fell in line with the increase, which was the third since last December. At that time, banks lifted their prime rate from 4½% to 5%; in March they upped it again to 5½%. Taken together, the rises amount to the swiftest jump in borrowing rates in a generation.

ON THE ESCALATOR

Because other loan rates are scaled upward from the prime rate, the increase means that the already high cost of borrowing money for everything from autos to homes, from financing business inventories to major industrial expansion will also escalate to new altitudes. While these effects will ripple through the economy slowly—depressing housing starts further and perhaps hurting auto and appliance sales—Wall Street reacted swiftly. Already jittery over Viet Nam, the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit and the cloudy prospects of higher taxes, the stock market staggered through its worst week in seven. The Dow-Jones industrial average of 30 key stocks sank briefly during one day's trading to 859—below the 864 bottom of its spring decline—and even after a rally closed the week with a 20-point loss, as 877.

Raising interest rates is the bankers' way of fighting inflation by rationing funds, the supply of which has been increasing rapidly this year—but not nearly so fast as the demand for money in the exuberant economy. Accordingly, the increase surprised neither bankers, brokers nor Washington. The prime-rate hike caused speculation that the Federal Reserve Board would any day now increase its 4½% discount rate—the amount it charges member banks for borrowing funds. Yet if the board acts, it seems likely to disrupt further the delicate competitive balance between the nation's financial institutions.

That disruption showed clearly last week in the increasingly wild rate war for savings deposits between commercial banks, savings banks, and savings and loan associations. In New York City, about a quarter of the mutual savings banks boosted their rates from 4½% to 5%. Even so, many reported "heavy" withdrawals by savers attracted to 5¼% "certificates of deposit"—money left to earn interest for a stated time—at commercial banks. In California, at least 40 associations followed the controversial lead of Los Angeles-based Home Savings & Loan in raising rates on passbook accounts from 5% to 5¼%, and on longer, 36-month accounts, to 5¾%. That move semed more successful; Home experienced a $2,600,000 savings gain in one day. But it brought angry criticism from other S & L men who cannot afford to match the increase.

A LAUGH AT DISTRESS

Responding to industry and congressional pressures to cool the fight, the Federal Reserve last week took a small step to make it unprofitable for commercial banks to pay high rates for certificates of deposit; it raised the reserves that banks must stash away against large time deposits from 4% to 5%. That only infuriated the board's critics. "An invisible crumb from the rich man's table," fumed Chairman Wright Patman of the House Banking Committee, "a horselaugh at people in distress."

Chairman John Horne of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board seemed to feel the same way. Calling the Reserve Board's action "minimal," he demanded among other things that action be taken to "reduce the widespread availabiltiy of certificates of deposit." With that, the HLBB handed S & Ls more power to fight back. Abandoning its only restraining weapon over S & L interest rates, the board suspended a policy cutting off S & Ls paying more than 4½% in most states (and 5% in California and Nevada) on passbook accounts from borrowing privileges at the twelve Federal Home Loan Banks. "We were simply fighting windmills," explained Horne. "Rather than penalize the good people who were holding the line on rates, we decided to discontinue a policy that was no longer effective."

Behind all the squabbling stands the awkward fact that a rapid rise in interest rates—the classic but imperfect monetary weapon against inflation—hurts some segments of the economy (such as savings institutions and housing) but leaves others (such as banks and industry) relatively unscathed. Partly for this reason, there are limits to how much credit can be tightened without so dislocating the economy as to threaten a recession. If Washington reduced its massive domestic spending on top of the cost of Viet Nam, banks and the Federal Reserve could pursue a gentler course.

In the Shadow of a Mighty Oak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, during the week of June 19 through 25, Sertoma International held its 54th annual convention here in Washington. I was very proud to have met the recipient of this outstandng service organization's 1966 Service to Mankind Award, Glenn M. Young. Mr. Young is one of my constituents from Hillsborough County, Fla., and I know all of us in the 10th Congressional District are extremely proud of this man and his record of over 40 years of service to the young people of this country.

Glenn Young lived in Duluth, Minn., from 1923 until his retirement to Florida in 1955. In those years, he served the Boy Scouts of Duluth in an extraordinary manner. Following his retirement in Tampa in 1955, he became active in Scouting in our State. He has founded no less than 44 Boy Scout troops since that time, and his immediate goal is 50 troops. He is personally responsible for opening the world of Scouting to more than 1,000 Tampa area youngsters, not to mention the more than 100 adult leaders he has recruited and trained for service. He has been and continues today to be a living inspiration to the youth of our Hillsborough County area.

In the June-July edition of the Sertoman, the national publication of Sertoma International, there is an interesting story of Glenn Young and his work in the service of mankind. In the words of the Dale Mabry Chapter of Sertoma in Tampa, which nominated him for this outstanding award, "we now sit for a moment in the shadow of a might oak—Mr. Glenn M. Young." I insert the article about Mr. Young appearing in the Sertoman in the Record at this point.

In the Shadow of a Mighty Oak: Sertoma International Presents 1966 Service to Mankind Award to Glenn M. Young

"The Oak is a mighty tree. Its roots reach deep into the soil and give it a timeless quality. We are humbled by its quiet and enduring strength . . . we now sit for a moment in the shadow of a mighty Oak . . . Mr. Glenn M. Young. . . ."

These were words used in presenting the Service to Mankind Award by the Dale Mabry Sertoma Club to its recipient for his many years of community service in scouting and first aid instruction. He, in turn, became the district and then the International award winner.

The first roots of Glenn Young's service reaches out more than 42 years. He was born in Coldwater, Ohio, and spent 37 years with the American Steel and Wire Company. His long career of voluntary service began when the U.S. Bureau of Mines initiated inplant first aid emergency training in 1923. Glenn was selected by his plant to receive this training.

In 1929, a camping trip brought forth the second and strongest root of his service. Glenn was married to a wonderfully patient woman and it was only natural that she encouraged him to heed the pleadings of their eldest son—a Boy Scout—to accompany him on an overnight hike. This was Glenn's introduction to Scouting. A few months later he became a Scout Committeeman and from that time—1930—until his retirement on February 1, 1955, he served Scouting in the Duluth, Minnesota, area in every conceivable "volunteer" position: Committeeman, First Aid Instructor and Merit Badge Counsellor for Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts and Cub Scouts, a Scoutmaster and an active member of the Duluth area Scouting Extension Committee.

So from 1923 to 1955, Glenn Young served well the youth of Duluth. He used his skills at emergency treatment many times in those 32 years to save life or to give comfort to industrial accident victims. He passed his knowledge of emergency treatment along to all who would accept it, whether adult or youth. For his faithful services to Scouting, he was awarded the Silver Beaver, the highest honor bestowed by the Boy Scouts of America.

But it was not in recognition of those years in Duluth that he was chosen as the Dale Mabry Sertoma Club's Service to Mankind Award winner. For when he "retired" and moved to Tampa he presented himself to Boy Scout officials there and, armed with letters of recommendation, he immediately began forming new contacts and locating areas where youngsters were in need of scout troops.

His legend is virtually unknown even to those whom he has served, for that is the kind of man this Glenn Young is. Each Scout unit sponsor—church, school, or neighborhood—is for the most part unaware that his efforts on their behalf are repeated over and over again on behalf of other units in other parts of the city.

Glenn's method of operation is simple and consistent. He locates an area of need, and then chooses a likely sponsor—preferably a church because reverence toward God and the creatures of God, as nature, go with Scouting. Before anyone knows "how," Glenn has rounded up the 25–35 boys; sold the institution on sponsorship; recruited and trained scoutmasters and committeemen; has a functioning, successful scout troop where shortly before there was none; and he has quietly faded out of the picture.

Since "retiring" in 1955, Glenn has performed this miracle 44 times, single-handedly. His immediate goal is 50 scout troops even though he already is personally responsible for opening the wide world of Scouting to more than 1,000 Tampa youngsters, not to mention the more than 100 adult leaders he has recruited and trained for service. Officials are helpless in the accounting of his services in man-hours each year. They are certain it exceeds 500 to 600 hours, but simply can't keep up with him.

In addition to organizational work, he teaches first aid to Scouts; serves as a first aid merit badge counselor and each year operates the emergency field aid tent for the Scouts' Camporee "treating all the things that happen to boys at summer camp."

In 1955 Glenn took a refresher first aid course and since that time he is credited with having taught 54 organized first aid classes. Each class requires 10 to 16 hours time. The more than 1,000 students of these classes do not include 50 public school bus drivers who must be properly certified to render emergency aid. Red Cross officials—like the Scouters—simply don't know how much time Glenn gives in teaching or "applying" first aid on behalf of the Red Cross.

Ask Glenn Young about the most unforgettable incident in his life and his mind leaps back to a dreary depression day in Duluth. There were two boys talking furtively, but Glenn's presence went unnoticed by either. They were plotting the robbery of a street car conductor. Both were Boy Scouts. Glenn's heart was saddened and he knew he had to take a chance on telling them that he knew of their plan. Fortunately, he succeeded in talking them out of the crime and back on the straight and narrow. He is grateful that he was able to see both boys grow up to become fine, productive men. Each has made many opportunities to let Glenn know how much his act has come to mean to them.

In this time when it is so easy to depend on "government," Glenn is teaching our youth to be self reliant; to "be prepared" to meet and solve life's challenges, each with his own initiative. Glenn Young is concerned and doing something for the young people of his community. He is quietly going about teaching youngsters to develop creative skills and, above all, encouraging them to honor their God and their country before all else.

Glenn has more than enough reasons to say, "I've done my share, now I'm entitled to a little more time for fishing and sunning." But he says without a trace of regret that he hasn't had time for fishing since he got his "Work" in Tampa organized.

Mr. Young's family includes two sons and two daughters of his own whose molding he shared with his wife. All four are steadfastly tracing their parent's steps in voluntary service to Red Cross and Scouting; there are 17 grandchildren and two great grandchildren who can be lavished with time and attention.

In presenting the award to Mr. Young, it was stated, Our Sertoma freedom program is one of the best tools we have to promote in every way the freedom of individuals and the maintenance of the principles of free enterprise; to encourage good citizenship. But we can't succeed without the Glenn Youngs who never stop caring; whose example keeps alive the spark of individuality; whose inspiration goads us to dedicate ourselves to the protection of our country rather than government protection of us.

We, as Sertomans everywhere, have the privilege of projecting our names into eternity on the strength of his courage and the quality of Glenn Young's service to his fellowman. He Serves Mankind.

Washington National Airport and the FAA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the past month, I have brought to the attention of the House, and to the Federal Aviation Agency, the serious problems confronting the traveling public at Washington National Airport.

I have pointed out in my statements to the House, the tremendous increase in traffic at Washington National and the physical impossibility to accommodate the number of flights in and out of this airport. I have also suggested that stricter regulations by FAA be initiated and that other airports, particularly Dulles, be utilized for long-haul flights.

I was therefore pleased to note that the FAA, on July 1, 1966, announced the adoption of a new policy effective August 7, 1966, which should greatly improve conditions at Washington National.

Under the new regulations, it is anticipated that long-haul flights will be drastically curtailed at Washington National, that the number of scheduled air taxi and general aviation flights will be equitably controlled along with commercial air carrier flights to secure maximum safety and prompt scheduling at Washington National.

While the changes suggested may not correct all of the problems, I believe this is a step in the right direction, and I commend the FAA administration and its Administrator, Gen. William F. McKee for this effort to improve service and to end congestion at Washington National Airport.

I anticipate that various organizations will be critical of this effort, but in my judgment it will make flying safer and certainly more comfortable and reliable for the traveling public.

I do believe, however, that the FAA should continue its efforts toward the solution of this and other problems confronting aviation in the Washington area. Certainly Bolling Field and other airports in this general area should be examined and, if possible, utilized to make the city of Washington conveniently acessible to general aviation traffic as well as scheduled commercial flights.

For some time many have been urging the utilization of the Bolling-Anacostia facility for nonscheduled air traffic. It makes good sense to me, and I hope along with the regulations recently announced, further study and early action will result in even better service and safer air transportation for the citizens of this country.

Our Goal Is Clear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has made our goal in Vietnam crystal clear.

We seek an honorable peace that will assure the independence of South Vietnam.

In his speeches at Omaha and Des Moines and in his news conference last Tuesday, the President distinctly restated our objectives for any who had failed previously to grasp them.

Many newspapers have commented on the President's unambiguous statements and have declared the vast majority of Americans stands firmly behind him. They express hope that Hanoi soon reaches the only logical conclusion—that we are not divided, that we do back the President—and accepts our standing offer to sit down at the peace table.

A great moral issue is involved in Vietnam.

Can free men merely look on as Communist aggressors take over a nation by force and exterminate or enslave its people?

The President has left no doubt of our response.

This is a matter widely discussed in the press. I offer for the RECORD editorials from the following newspapers on this subject and other aspects of our position in Vietnam:

The Philadelphia Inquirer, Houston Chronicle, Washington Evening Star, Arizona Republic, Portland Oregonian, Christian Science Monitor, and Houston Post.

I also offer an article by Richard Wilson, the syndicated columnist.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, July 2, 1966]

The Goal of Peace in Vietnam

If Hanoi's leaders "will only let me know when and where they would like to ask us directly what can be done to bring peace to South Vietnam, I will have my closest and most trusted associates at that time and at that place in a matter of hours."

This is the President of the United States speaking and, if there ever was a clear, direct appeal for peace negotiations from one party to another, it is here.

How can anyone assert fairly that the U.S. is to blame for the continuance, and the stepping up, of hostilities, and for failing to take positive steps toward negotiation, in face of President Johnson's declarations in Des Moines?

Yet we find his critics, in and out of the U.S. Senate, and in and out of this country, harping still on their favorite theme that, if it were not for the Johnson Administration's stubborn policy of aggression, the war in Vietnam would be ended.

Has it ever occurred for even a fleeting second to these people that it is Hanoi, and not the U.S., that has prevented peace talks? Why are some Americans so quick to find their own countrymen the villains in the conflict, and to exculpate their country's enemies?

The U.S. has been searching for ways and means to bring the Communists to the conference table for many months. It has been rebuffed in its every attempt, right up to now.

Our persistence in seeking negotiations has been seized upon as evidence by the Communists that we are weakening in our resolution to continue the war. Their miscalculations in this direction have been reinforced by the peace demonstrations in America and by the loud criticism of the President's policy in Congress.

It has been necessary to prove to Hanoi and the Vietcong that we are not folding up; that we are as determined as ever to uphold our commitments and to resist Red aggression. The bombings in North Vietnam are a part of that necessary strategy, although one might think, from the outraged comments in some quarters, that the U.S. has performed an act of brutal treachery against a peaceable and defenseless people.

The U.S. has shown that it wants peace. The Communists won't want peace until they can be shown that they can't win militarily on their own terms.

[From the Houston Chronicle, July 2, 1966]

Let There Be No Doubt

President Johnson's Omaha address was an earnest, eloquent effort to explain the moral justification for the U.S. presence in Viet Nam. He obviously was appealing for understanding and support from critics, both at home and abroad, who oppose U.S. policy.

The timing of his speech was significant, also, since it came just after U.S. planes launched intensive attacks on oil storage facilities on the outskirts of Hanoi and Haiphong.

Mr. Johnson correctly pointed out that the Communists hope we are losing heart. They are banking on us to bog down in disagreement, doubt and confusion. But they are wrong, the President said.

The President met head-on the frequently heard contention that the war in Viet Nam is essentially an internal conflict.

"Let these be no doubt about it," he said. "Those who say this is merely a Vietnamese 'civil war' are wrong." The Hanoi government started the warfare in 1959 and has increasingly supported the flow of men and arms into the south. The Communist campaign is directed and led by a skilled professional staff in North Viet Nam, he said, and only a small minority of the population of South Viet Nam supports it.

The sincerity and the earnestness of the President shows through the phrases of his speech. He talked of South Viet Nam's right to decide its own destiny, of the importance of the fight for the rest of free Asia, of the necessity for proving to the Communists that they cannot win with the new type of aggression—internal subversion and guerrilla warfare.

The United States, Mr. Johnson said, seeks nothing in Viet Nam but an honorable peace. We seek nothing in or from Red China. But so long as Hanoi refuses to end its aggression, "we will carry on. No one knows how long it will take. But I can and do here and now tell you this: The aggression will not succeed. The people of South Viet Nam will be given the chance to work out their own destiny . . ."

It was a message which stems, we suspect, from the agony of presidential decision-making. But Mr. Johnson's determination is clear. The United States will do what it has to do. We can only hope that the rulers in North Viet Nam understand this message and act on it before further escalation of this unfortunate war is necessary.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 6, 1966]

Escalation Pressures

A few days ago Pennsylvania's Governor Scranton said he approved the President's action in authorizing the bombing of fuel dumps in the Hanoi-Haiphong area, but that it would have been more efficient militarily and less contentious diplomatically if it had been done earlier.

The governor may be right, although we don't recall any earlier demand from him for these bombing attacks. Still, the point is arguable—and this it more than can be said for some of the other comments which have attended this escalation of the war. One of these is a statement by an unidentified senior naval officer that he would like to bomb Ho Chi Minh's headquarters at Hanoi. There doubtless are other military commanders who would like to do this sort of thing, and it is the best argument we can think of for leaving the decisions on further escalation where they belong—with the President.

Since the first bombs fell in the north some 17 months ago, Mr. Johnson has moved slowly, cautiously and reluctantly to step up the raids. His objective has been to curb infiltration of South Viet Nam by blowing up bridges, railroads, highways and the like—all the while trying to induce the enemy to come to the conference table. When these hopes were disappointed he moved on to the bombing of oil depots, a necessary but still limited measure in support of the troops fighting the battle in the south.

The President has clearly indicated that other military targets will be destroyed if necessary, and this is right. But these decisions, as with the earlier ones, should be made carefully and with deliberation. Other factors than those of a purely military nature must be taken into account. For example, there has been a clamor for mining the port of Haiphong, and this may yet have to be done. But the risks involved in the possible sinking of ships of other nations such as the Soviet Union are obvious enough.

Mr. Johnson spoke hopefully yesterday of diplomatic reports which indicate that the Communists no longer expect a military victory in Viet Nam. Even if this is true, however, it does not necessarily follow that the end is in sight.

Other reports say that North Viet Nam is evacuating from Hanoi all civilians whose presence is not essential to their war effort. Some 500,000 people have been sent out since the bombings began, and more now are to be moved.

This suggests that Ho Chi Minh is digging in for a long war. If so, more decisions, perhaps drastic decisions, may have to be made. But the President should not be pressured into any abondonment of the cautious resolution that has characterized his handling of the problem thus far.

[From the Arizona Republic, July 3, 1966]

The Goal Is the Same

President Johnson did not lightly reach the decision to bomb Communist oil installations near Hanoi and Haiphong. Getting so close to the enemy's population centers was bound to raise considerable opposition, both here and abroad. But the President realizes, if others don't, that in war there is no substitute for victory. He obviously means to win the Vietnam War, and we think the decision is wise.

As for escalation, the American bombing decision was made in response to the Communist decision to send regular Vietcong army detachments into South Vietnam. These are not guerrillas, carrying their supplies on their backs down jungle trails. They are well-trained troops, equipped with sophisticated weapons, and moving on trucks that are powered with gasoline. Bombing the highways and bridges has not proved capable of stopping the trucks. But they can't move without gasoline, and Wednesday's raids were aimed at 60 per cent of the North Vietnamese petroleum supply dumps.

It used to be said that the United States could not possibly cope with the guerrillas in South Vietnam. It is now apparent that we have done so. In fact, we have been so effective that North Vietnam has sent in regular army units operating with full equipment. Clashes approaching the division level have occurred. Here, too, the U.S. forces have shown their ability to prevail on the field of battle. But enemy supply lines can now best be cut by denying the enemy oil, and that's exactly what the U.S. is doing.

In Secretary McNamara's words, the war has been escalated from guerrilla action to "a quasi-conventional military action." The shift was initiated by the North Vietnamese. The United States has responded. But our aims in this war remain the same, to force North Vietnam to stop its aggression against South Vietnam.

As President Johnson put it in his Des Moines address Thursday, "As long as they persist in their aggression against South Vietnam, we will resist aggression. As long as they carry on, we will persevere. They cannot wear us down and they cannot escape paying a very high price for their aggression."

Despite some opposition to his Vietnam policy, President Johnson has the mass of the American people behind him. For most Americans realize that the issue here is more than keeping a pledge to South Vietnam, important as that may be. The real question is whether communism can take over an independent country by force, while the free world stands by impotent to stop it.

Those who want the U.S. to get out of Vietnam should remember that communism has been set back on its heels more than once in Asia. It was stopped cold when the Hukbalahap movement was beaten in the Philippines; it was defeated in Malaya; it has been routed in Indonesia. A defeat of communism in South Vietnam now would permit the peaceful development of Southeast Asia. And that's exactly what President Johnson is aiming at.

[From the Portland Oregonian, July 2, 1966]

UNTENABLE WAR VIEWS

The difference of opinion on the Viet Nam war between Rep. ROBERT B. DUNCAN, Democrat, and Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, Republican, Oregon's nominees for the U.S. Senate, is clearly defined in their responses to the bombing of heretofore immune oil depots in Hanoi and Haiphong.

Rep. DUNCAN held the bombings to be "essential to the continued success of our defense of South Viet Nam." He said he would have "long ago selected these installations for pin-point bombing."

After a one-day delay for consideration, Gov. Hatfield deplored the bombing escalation as taking us "closer to confrontation with Red China and the Soviet Union." He saw this action as sinking "deeper and deeper into the quicksand of an Asian land war against which we have been warned by military experts for decades."

This and other statements on the Viet Nam war by Gov. Hatfield are wholly unacceptable to the editors of this newspaper, who recognize the sincerity of the governor's views.

He and other critics of U.S. policy in Southeast Asia who now cry out against bombing certain previously exempt military objectives in North Viet Nam have also condemned bombing of enemy concentrations in South Viet Nam, the nation under attack from Communist forces. There position is that the United States should "deescalate" rather than escalate its military actions. Essentially, their views are in harmony with those of the earlier advocates of the "enclave" theory. Their idea is that by withdrawing from the battlefield the United States would somehow influence the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese to sue for peace.

When President Johnson listened to this kind of advice and suspended the then very limited bombing of military movements and supply bases in North Viet Nam for 37 days, the reaction of the enemy was anything but conciliatory. The cost in American lives may not be measured exactly. But North Viet Nam used the suspension to send more thousands of regular troops into South Viet Nam, to step up the infiltration of heavy weapons, and to gather strength for bloodier assaults on U.S.-South Vietnamese positions.

We do not know on what logic Gov. Hatfield bases his idea that depriving the North Vietnamese of their "privileged sanctuaries" of military power brings us nearer to war with Red China and the Soviet Union, or "deeper into the quicksand of an Asian land war." From a military standpoint, the greater use of air power against the aggressor would seem to relieve the enemy's pressure on U.S. and allied toops in South Viet Nam. There is no intimation from Moscow or Peking that they consider the Hanoi and Haiphong bombings in a different category than the more limited bombings which preceded them. There is no reason to think that the United States has committed itself at any time to fight a massive land war in Asia, beyond the commitment of defending South Viet Nam from Communist aggression.

The idea that the war can be stopped by refusing to fight it has been refuted at every stage of the long, careful escalation of U.S. effort. We see no justification for the critics' insistence that South Viet Nam cannot be freed from Communist aggression, nor for their protests against every military action designed to accomplish that. We do not think the price will be too high to stop Communist conquest. We do think that liberation of South Viet Nam is the most important objective of the free world since the Communist invasion of South Korea was hurled back, primarily by U.S. military power, in the 1550s.

We wish Gov. Hatfield and other critics would face the reality of Communist aggression rather than wring their hands over the bloodshed it is causing. What they are advocating, in that final phase they do not wish to discuss, is U.S. withdrawal. If they have gone all the way back to the isolationist doctrine of a "Fortress America," they ought to say so.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 5, 1966]

THE PRESIDENT'S STRONG WORDS

President Johnson has strongly reemphasized that neither Communist resistance on the battlefield nor divided counsels at home will deter Washington pressing the Vietnamese war with increasing vigor and strength. It is thus clear that limited but nonetheless clear escalation of the war can be looked for by the Communists, the American people and the rest of the world. It is the President's strongly reiterated thesis that—

Only thus can enough pressure eventually be brought upon the Communists to convince them both that the war cannot be won and that the continuing struggle is not worth the increasingly heavy price they will have to pay.

America's pledges and the necessity of halting aggression, terrorism, and the threat to regional independence make it obligatory for the United States to push its efforts to the point where peace negotiations are begun.

No one can know at this stage just how far such escalation will go. Clearly, Washington hopes that the apparently effective air strikes against North Vietnamese oil dumps will have both a mental and military effect upon Hanoi. If they do not, the President's words indicate that further steps will follow.

We hope with the President that this latest evidence of America's determination and its military potential will convince the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong that they can no longer expect a military victory. Although we have long hoped that raids so close to Hanoi and Haiphong could be avoided, it is obvious that the oil dumps near these cities are military targets of considerable importance.

We, too, wish that it were possible to convince the Communists of both the fruitlessness and the evil of seeking to thrust their rule upon the South Vietnamese through war, assassination and terror. In fact, we wish that the vigor of the President's speech would signal to Hanoi that divisions and discussions at home indicate no weakening in America's determination and that the Communists will never be able to get better peace terms than they could get today. At the same time there is no legitimate reason for the President to imply, as he seemed to do, that his critics lack patriotism, courage, or wisdom.

This newspaper reiterates its oft-given conviction that each step in escalation be carefully and prayerfully weighed before being taken. We do not believe that this will inhibit such military moves as will help toward peace. Rather, we believe that it will ensure that such moves are tailored to the over-all military, diplomatic, and humanitarian requirements of the situation.

[From the Houston Post, July 3, 1966]

TRUE MORAL ISSUE IN VIETNAM

Opponents of any American action to help the people of South Viet Nam keep their freedom reacted predictably to the bombing of a few oil storage tanks on the outskirts of Hanoi and Haiphong.

Their tender concern for petroleum storage facilities is ludicrous, of course, but at least they are consistent in opposing and denouncing anything that makes it harder for Communists to kill American and South Vietnamese fighting men.

One can respect them perhaps for their consistency but hardly for pretending that their opposition is based on morality, by which they fool nobody unless it is themselves.

Under the twisted reasoning that they use in trying to justify their positions, it is moral for Communists to try to take what they want by force, but it is immoral for anyone to oppose them.

It is moral for Communists to commit aggression and try to impose their brand of tyranny upon others, but it is immoral to defend freedom.

It is moral for Communists to practice murder, terrorism, assassination and barbaric cruelty against civilians on a mass scale, but it is immoral if some noncombatants unavoidably are killed or wounded in the course of non-Communist defensive military operations.

It is moral for Communists to use every weapon, tactic or device available to them, but it is immoral for non-Communists to use the weapons they have against Communists.

It is moral for Communists to kill large numbers of unarmed civilians by exploding bombs in the streets of Saigon or elsewhere, but it is immoral to use napalm or B-52 bombers against Communist combatants.

It is moral for Communists to increase their military effort, but it is immoral for non-Communists to try to match or offset that escalation.

It is moral for Communists to kill countless numbers of North Vietnamese in trying to impose their system upon the people of the North and to change the whole Vietnamese pattern of life, but it is immoral for at least half of the Vietnamese people to refuse to submit to this enslavement.

And now, it is moral for Communists to import and use petroleum products for purposes of killing Americans and South Vietnamese, but it is immoral to try to keep them from doing so.

Much is made of the fact that the oil storage facilities bombed were near heavily populated areas. Their location is, of course, under the control of the North Vietnamese government. The choice is not that of the South Vietnamese or American governments. The Communists never have been deterred by the fact that a target was in a populated area, whether a city or a village.

Actually, the bombing of the oil tanks was a precision operation, with great effort being made to prevent civilian casualties. The targets were, in fact, somewhat isolated from thickly populated areas. And, if some civilians were in the areas where the bombs fell, it was not from lack of warning. Some Washington newsmen collaborated in seeing to that.

There is a moral issue in Viet Nam, a very important one, although one to which opponents of American action appear blind. It is whether or not other free people should stand aside and permit more than 15 million people who want no part of Communism to be either exterminated or enslaved. That is the moral issue that has been involved in Viet Nam from the beginning of the Communist effort to take over South Viet Nam. Who then are the truly morally guilty?

It can be argued that the use of physical force in human relations always is immoral, under any circumstances, but it can be even more immoral not to defend the things to which one attaches great value against those who do use force.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, July 3, 1966]

Raids Reflect Harder Attitude on Viet Goals

(By Richard Wilson)

Possibly of more significance than the expanded scope of the bombing is the hardening of attitudes at the highest levels here on the nature of a settlement of the war in Viet Nam.

If there was ever any concern that President Johnson would settle for something considerably less than the sacrifices justify, it is now dispelled. That is the inner meaning of the increased bombing and the renewed alertness for any sign that Ho Chi Minh is ready to negotiate.

It was a hard decision requiring a finding that the only way to bring Ho Chi Minh to the bargaining table was to hurt him much more, on the order of two or three times the punishment inflicted on North Viet Nam in the past.

Along with that finding went the determination that any settlement that resulted could not be permitted to be another Laotian fiasco in which the United States pulled out but the Communists remained. It was concluded that the only way to get a meaningful settlement was to drive the government of North Viet Nam to it, and make Ho Chi Minh want it.

These cruel decisions were not easily taken, and it is not known if they will produce the desired result, but if they do not it can be foreseen that the screw will be tightened again.

The basic strategic measurement made at the highest level here is that China will not enter the war directly, even though both Chinese and Russian aid may be increased as the United States steps up the military pressure.

No illusions are entertained of quick results from the stepped up war. It is obvious that at this stage the United States is not planning to invade and subdue North Viet Nam, or destroy its government. Our military effort is still limited, but the limits are expanding and thus this is the factor relied on to convince Ho Chi Minh that he must negotiate without the preconditions he had so far outlined.

Johnson appears far more settled in his mind on the rightness of his course than earlier this year, when he was somewhat unsettled by the increasing public concern over the war and the internal disturbances.

The chief problem at present is continuing public support for the war. The President made it clear in his recent visit to the Midwest that he will not weaken in his determination. More than this, he will make the determining issue in the congressional campaign support or non-support of the United States in a dangerous war. When this is the issue there is usually little doubt of the outcome.

Some highly unrealistic illusions were indulged by Republican candidates for Congress who came here to attend a "candidates school" conducted by the Republican National Committee for the ostensible purpose of showing these candidates how to win. Some of them seemed quite out of touch with the trend of events here. They thought that the President would engineer a peace-at-any cost negotiation just prior to election day to influence the outcome. They reasoned that the President would take action a few days before the election so that voters would not really have a chance to determine if he was right or wrong but would be caught up in enthusiasm for peace at any price.

This is about as remote from the actual conditions existing as it is possible to get. While it might be conceivable that between now and November Ho Chi Minh would decide he would have had all he could take, it is not conceivable that Johnson would back down and seek a truce on North Viet Nam's conditions.

The conditions to which he already agrees are as far as he is likely to go. These conditions permit Ho Chi Minh to stop fighting without risking the loss of his capital, his country or his head. This is about as generous a bargain as was ever offered an aggressor, and Ho Chi Minh is counted on to recognize it as such as the bombing and other coming attacks continue and increase.

Home Buying Bogged by Rising Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, home buyers are finding it increasingly difficult to find mortgage money they can afford. While the supply of money is bigger than ever, the demand for it is too, largely because of the economic boom, and also due to competition for funds in our burgeoning Federal establishment. The resulting tight money makes interest rates higher and downpayments larger.

Mr. Sam Dawson of the Associated Press recently wrote an article outlining the plight of the family attempting to purchase a home. Under unanimous consent, I include his column in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press, July 8, 1966]

With Money Tight—Home Buying Bogged by Rising Interest Rate

(By Sam Dawson)

NEW YORK.—John and his wife had made up their minds. They would take the $30,000 house in the neighborhood where they thought their children would have a better chance. The down payment of $3,000 had finally been scraped together. Monthly payments on the mortgage would be pretty high for them; but they thought they could swing it, just barely.

"Sorry," said the real estate agent. "You should have come back a month ago. Now, the only possible source for the money to finance the purchase is asking a down payment of $6,000. And the interest on the mortgage has gone from 5.5 per cent to 6.5 per cent. Money's tight, you know."

John and his wife and the children are staying in the old neighborhood.

On the other side of the country, an aggressive junior executive was being moved to a new post. Joe was happy at the promotion. His family was reconciled to leaving their friends and the home his wife liked so much. A buyer had been lined up for it.

GOES BEYOND REACH

But just before the deed was to be signed, the would-be buyer backed out. He still liked the house. But to swing the deal for him, the lender of the mortgage money was now asking much more in down payment and carrying charges that would put the monthly payments beyond the stretching point of the prospect's income—even if the asking price for the house was shaved. The lender had explained it was hard to find any money, even costlier money, for the deal—and the going interest rates for everything were up, way up.

Much the same thing is reported here and there by professional builders. The financial institutions that carry them while they build and hunt for home buyers are hard to deal with just now. Banks and savings and loan associations say they're short of funds to lend. They also are fearful that home buyers able to handle the costlier mortgages may prove few and far between.

Tight money is coming as a shock to many folk because the money supply actually is bigger than ever before. But there's a booming demand for credit to run a booming economy. Businessmen are competing for loans. Government agencies and private corporations are selling securities—and competing for any available money.

Homes are still being sold, and still being built. But financial institutions that traditionally lend the money for the purchase of homes are finding it harder to get more deposits, because people with idle money can get higher returns by depositing elsewhere, or buying securities.

EXCEEDS 6 PERCENT MARK

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board reports that in May the average interest rate on conventional home mortgage loans in this country rose to 6.02 per cent, compared with 5.77 per cent a year ago. But in many areas the rate was well above the average. In the San Francisco-Oakland area the average was 6.49 per cent, in Atlanta 6.41 per cent, in Denver 6.40 per cent. The lowest in the country was the Boston area at 5.55 per cent.

The average term of maturity for mortgages was above 24 years, with a range of around 23 years in Boston and Philadelphia, to 29 years in New York. The average purchase price for new homes rose to $26,500 from $24,700 a year ago, with the highest being the Boston area at $34,500 and the lowest in Baltimore at $21,600.

The higher interest, bigger down payments, difficulty of finding money available to finance the mortgage have cut off some would-be home buyers here and there. Others may be finding it harder to buy a house because all their bills seem to be going higher, and their taxes, and demands on their incomes.

Getting a mortgage seems a lot tougher in some places where it once seemed easy. Meeting the monthly payments is tougher, too, for a lot of folk. They could still get a mortgage—if they could meet the price.

Malawi: Independence Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on July 6, while this body was in recess, the nation of Malawi observed the second anniversary of its independence and proclaimed itself a republic within the British Commonwealth. It is with extreme pleasure that I take this opportunity to extend warmest greetings to His Excellency Kamuzu Banda, first President of the Republic of Malawi; to His Excellency Vincent H. B. Gondwe, Malawi's Ambassador to the United States; and to all the people of Malawi.

Malawi, formerly known as Nyasaland, was years ago an important base of operations for the slave trade. The territory was relatively unknown until men such as the explorer-missionary David Livingstone ventured there in the latter half of the 19th century. Livingstone was a foe of the slave trade and his explorations led to the establishment of missions by the Church of Scotland and the Free Church of Scotland in 1874–75 to carry on his work. In 1878, the African Lakes Co. was formed by Scottish businessmen to supply the missions and to combat slave trading through the establishment of commercial alternatives.

The task of eliminating the remaining slave trading groups fell to the British Government, which annexed the territory in 1891. The British Protectorate of Nyasaland continued until 1953, when it was joined with Southern Rhodesia and Northern Rhodesia in the Central African Federation. However, Nyasaland preferred an independent future and the Federation dissolved.

A smooth transition from colonial rule to responsible African government continued, and Nyasaland became an independent member of the British Commonwealth on July 6, 1964.

Rich in natural splendor, Malawi has been described as one of the most beautiful countries in Africa. Her striking mountain scenery and Lake Nyasa, third largest in all of Africa, make Malawi a highly attractive country for the development of tourism.

Malawi's agriculturally based economy is similar to those of many of the newly independent African States. She depends upon agriculture for the main source of her export earnings. The country is endowed with good land and imaginative management has resulted in increased production. A major effort in this direction is the young pioneer program which teaches young Malawians new agricultural methods. Other projects are a $1 million sugar factory, a textile mill, housing construction, and a transistor radio plant. A $9 million hydroelectric facility will provide enough power for any planned expansion through 1975.

I am sure that you will agree with me that the above facts indicate that Malawi is using its independence with skill and imagination. There are problems to be overcome, it is true, but the courage and determination demonstrated by the people of Malawi can lead one to conclude that they will overcome. I congratulate them on a job well done and urge them to continue in the tradition of unselfishness and achievement as the Republic of Malawi marches forward under a banner of cooperation and progress.

South African Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Congress the following article entitled "South African Justice" from the May 20, 1966, issue of New Statesman. It describes the steady expansion of apartheid barbarities and how such barbarities have finally and completely subverted any administration of justice in political trials in South African lower courts. As one who spent the Saturday and Sunday of June 24 and 25 in Mississippi as one of 20,000 participants in the march to the State capitol in Jackson, I cannot overlook the moral obligation to call again to notice the devastating sameness of details and of the issues of political justice—voting participation and court justice—behind the Mississippi demonstration and in the prevailing conditions in South Africa.

It was not a new declaration, that which President Johnson said on the recent anniversary of the Organization of African Unity. Despite the conflicting history of its relations with black people of this Nation, America's advocation has been from inception that "human rights will not be restricted in this country nor supported in our policies abroad." This indefensible and nationally humiliating gap between our pronouncements and our deeds must be, now, finally and completely closed. We can ignore, but history moves to relentlessly repeat its truth that freedom and justice prevails for all or survives for none. We must in this Congress take the step which is open to us to lift continuing restrictions on human rights in this country through the civil rights legislation we have pending in this body. As concerns our relations with other nations, we must demonstrate the credibility of our pronouncements affirming human rights by ending our promotion and fostering of special interests in other lands which in fact give support to the denial of human rights.

The article follows:

SOUTH AFRICAN JUSTICE

(By James Fairbairn)

It used to be said that, however unjust white South Africa's laws were, the courts would provide a fair trial. Even with 'pass-law' convictions being churned out at the rate of one every three minutes, this was once at least partly true of serious—i.e. political—trials. It is true no longer, at least in the lower courts, as is shown by Christian Action's booklet *The Purge of the Eastern Cape* (1s. 6d. from 2 Amen Court, EC4).

Hundreds of former members of Chief Luthuli's banned African National Congress and of the rival PAC are being systematically and brutally seized by Verwoerd's security police in the Eastern Cape, traditionally an area of African struggle and militancy, and held indefinitely without charge. If they crack under the strain of prolonged interrogation, which often includes assaults and sometimes physical as well as mental torture, and agree to give the kind of evidence required, they become state witnesses. Those who somehow hold out become the accused.

The conservative Johannesburg *Star* has aptly spoken of the 'practice of arresting in haste and collecting evidence at leisure'. Frequently the charges relate to actions allegedly committed three or four years ago, making it almost impossible to prove an alibi, yet state witnesses unable to recollect events four months old are drilled to give precise and detailed 'evidence' which, however absurd or even fantastic, they recite with a pathetic air of intense self-satisfaction. To listen to them is 'like hearing parrots come to court'. Asked to repeat earlier evidence about a meeting allegedly held three years ago, one African witness said: 'I am trying to repeat it word perfect, so that there should be no argument'. He then reeled off a long list of names in the identical order given months before. Questioned by the defence about this feat, he proudly replied 'Word perfect. Word perfect.' It transpired that he and two other state witnesses had been held in a cell with an African security policeman. The defence asked: 'And is he with you all the time?' Witness: 'All the time.' Defence: 'When he goes to the toilet he takes you with him?' Witness: No reply. Defence: 'No answer to that?' Witness: 'No, there is an answer.' Defence: 'Yes?' Witness: 'Yes, there must be an answer. Each and every question has to have its answer.' With intense pride, he then suddenly volunteered information about the allegedly violent aims of the ANC, word for word as set out in the charge-sheet in the trial, which was accessible only to the court, the prosecution, the defence and the police.

This is typical of what goes on at the trials. Most are held in remote hamlets, trial dates are withheld until the last moment, the venue changed without warning, and the charge-sheets are conveniently cyclostyled with only names to be filled in to answer to vaguely drawn charges. The security police decide who may attend court and who may visit awaiting trial prisoners; they supervise or exclude the press, and they tell the prosecutors who is to be charged, who is to give evidence and how the cases are to be conducted. The resident magistrates usually refuse defence requests for further particulars and grant the inevitable prosecution request for state witnesses to appear in camera. The severity of the sentences has become frightening—as is intended.

Men already fined or imprisoned for an offence are recharged, years later, for the same offence. Thus the employees of the Bay Transport Company in Port Elizabeth were fined £7 10s. each in 1961 for having gone on strike, which is forbidden to Africans under any circumstances. Three and a half years later several were rearrested. It was then alleged that the strike had been organised by the ANC and, after more than a year awaiting trial in prison, they have now been sentenced to four and a half years' imprisonment.

Only donated money and the courage of a remarkable core of good men and women of all races has hitherto enabled Defence and Aid in South Africa to challenge in the higher courts the justice acted out in apartheid's lower courts. When Mrs. Diana Collins was in South Africa last year, she commissioned Miss Mary Benson to compile the report which forms the basis of *Purge of the Eastern Cape.* An early unsigned copy of the material was seized by Verwoerd's security police last year. Subsequently Miss Benson was placed under house arrest and prohibited from writing. Next came the banning of Defence and Aid, a decision which was upheld this week, and most recently the banning of Miss Ruth Hayman, the brave and tenacious solicitor who has been almost alone in being prepared to act for political prisoners. The families of convicted men and women are mercilessly hounded, but most whites choose to ignore the whole thing, too afraid of the police and human involvement even to give cast-off clothing to the starving children of political prisoners.

Yet, as in prison, some still retain their integrity. Legal ways and means are being found of channelling funds to them to at least help the desperately needy families; there are up to 4,000 such women and children around Port Elizabeth alone. This is surely one time when banning is the highest recommendation of an organisation—and for increased support of Christian Action's Defence and Aid Fund.

The Soul of the Polish Millennium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, upon the occasion of the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Christianity in Poland, many commemorative religious services and events have been sponsored and scheduled. These millennium observances have great meaning not only for the more than 8 million loyal Americans who pride themselves in their Polish ancestry, but for all who enjoy independence and liberty today.

Among the leaders active in the celebration of this important event is Mr. Henry J. Osinski, of Buffalo, N.Y., who is lay chairman of the Polish millennium observance for the diocese of Buffalo. Prominent in many community affairs and religious endeavors, Mr. Osinski serves as treasurer of the Polish Union of America; chairman of Villa Maria College's advisory board of regents; vice president of the Community Welfare Council; and treasurer of the Urban League of Buffalo. He also is a member of the Council of Youth for the State of New York; board of regents of Canisius College; and the board of trustees of Catholic Charities, in Buffalo.

Mr. Osinski is the author of an article which appeared in a May issue of Magnificant, published by the Buffalo diocese, entitled "The Soul of the Polish Millennium." This article was reprinted in the Ampol Eagle, July 7, 1966, a Buffalo weekly newspaper. Under leaye to extend my remarks, I include it below:

THE SOUL OF THE POLISH MILLENNIUM

(By Henry J. Osinski)

One thousand years of fidelity to the Chirstian faith—to the Roman Catholic Church—Ever faithful—Ever loyal—Ever ready to defend and die for her faith.

Semper Fidelis Polonia-such were the words and phrases used by the church in referring to her noble and loyal daughter, Poland.

For ten centuries, during which she passed many trials because of her steadfastness to Christianity, and particularly to the Roman Catholic Church, Poland never for once doubted the validity of her belief. Poland is ever mindful that once she accepted the church, she placed upon herself an obligation to defend the truths which are the dogma of the Roman Catholic faith.

To Poland and her people, Christianity is not political expedience necessary for preservation of her sovereignty.

Poland did not accept the Roman Catholic faith either to gain power or prestige among nations of the world.

Poland accepted Christianity for in it she found the true reason for her creation and existence. In Christianity, the Polanie found the answer to life's many mysteries. The dwellers of early plains of Poland, known as Polanie, were people of resolute purpose. Life and everything about them had a reason for existence and useful purpose to man. Man, as far as they were concerned, had to have a greater and higher destiny than the material nature around him. They felt they were superior to their environment, but could not find an answer in their images which they worshipped.

All of life's sufferings, tribulations and sacrifices appeared to them in vain, for their Gods recognized only strength, brutal force and material ends. All this seemed ineffectual, for their soul pined for love, understanding, tolerance, compassion and mercy. Without them life seemed meaningless, directing them towards some confused, inexplainable, and subservient destiny with their man-created God.

A RAY OF LIGHT

Baptism, by Mieszko in 966, was the ray of light that pierced their darken pagan atmosphere, nourishing their strayed heart and souls with true faith, firm hope, and Christ's charity. This sacramental ray of light unleashed the latent spiritual forces in the Polish Nation, initiating a Christian movement which has never lost its momentum.

Over centuries, Christian faith carried the people of Poland through crisis upon crisis, without tarnishing their faith, nor their determination to keep it, protect it, and, if necessary, die for it. History teaches us that many people lost their allegiance to Christianity and the Roman Catholic Church under circumstances in many instances less critical than those of the people of Poland.

Since the year 966, Christianity became the core, the substance, the soul of the Polish Nation and its people's culture. Catholic thought and action transcended every phase of private, public and national life.

A WAY OF LIFE

The Roman Catholic faith became deeply rooted in the very marrow of their bones and in every faculty of their souls. Since 966 Catholicism is not only the faith, but the way of life; the only valid passport to the eternal city of God.

Time flees-governments are recorded in annals of history—political ideologies, social and cultural movements, civic and economic reforms came and left their imprints on the lives of the people.

Wars, during the course of centuries, forced reconstruction in villages, towns and cities.

Religious reformations were rampant all over Europe. New religions, sects, and denominations were being established overnight.

Spiritual insecurity and spiritual chaos reigned in Europe in the middle ages. Catholicism was attacked by everyone. Rome found itself constantly on the defense. Confusion reigned for a time in the Vatican. The Roman Catholic Church, for a time, found itself in organizational turmoil. The Middle Ages were really darkened and the horizons did not appear bright.

The French Revolution, with its atheistic philosophy, followed the reformation. Many felt that it would find fertile soil in Poland. The Polish and French cultures, for many years, found themselves compatible. The French influence was felt everywhere in Poland. Chopin, Moniuszko, Mickiewicz, and others, found haven in France when alien forces persecuted them in Poland.

A TEST OF FAITH

Partitions came and lasted for over a century and a half. The people of Poland were without their own government. Prussian, Russian and Austrian cultures were being superimposed on the lives of people. Persecution was at its height. The people of Poland were deprived of their God-given dignities and rights. Many fled to foreign lands, not to escape and forget, but to better resist and preserve all that is Catholic and Polish.

The Prussian Cross pressed heavily in Europe. Bismark was unifying the anti-Catholic forces in neighboring countries to the west. Russian Empress and Czars were forcing their political, social and religious concepts on the Poles in the Eastern Europe.

The Twentieth Century found the people for two decades masters of their destinies. But, the liberty was not long lived. Again the tyrants of East and West became determined to destroy all that is Catholic and Polish in the land of the Polanie.

Yet, through all this, the people of Poland remained steadfast. Their faith was unshaken. False prophets found no haven in Poland. In fact, Poland was the country they all feared, for they could find none in this land of soil dwellers to espouse their false gospels.

STRENGTH THROUGH SUFFERING

Ten centuries passed and the first love is still there. It has survived all man devised trials, tribulations and struggles. The seeds of truth sowed on the day of Mieszko's Baptism found deep roots in the fertile hearts and minds of the God-fearing, God-loving Polanie. The suffering and persecution served only to fortify and strengthen their faith and love for Christ and His Church.

The Polanie felt that they too made a covenant with God, through their sacrament of Baptism in the Church, established by His beloved Son. This covenant was for eternity and no force on earth could break it. The suffering they experienced, and are experiencing because of the faithfulness to it, is to them a test of their love for Christ and His Church.

This test they welcome; for it assures them of their eternal destiny, of the kinship to the Son of God.

All in passing here on earth. It is the eternal life that is their hope. The love of God has and is their strength—for that is a lasting and eternal love. Such love can only be ever faithful, ever loyal.

The Cross of Christianity, taken voluntarily by Mieszko and his wife, Daobrowka in 966, was and still is the guiding light and national symbol of Poland. The Moors, the Tartars, the Huns, the Prussians, the Hapsburgs, the Cossacks, the Communists, all struck their fiercest blows at the people of Poland to break their covenant with the Son of God, without success.

CROSS IS AGELESS

The Cross is still the Way of Life for the Polish people. With the Cross to lead them and Our Lady of Czestochowa to shield them, the people of Poland began a new Millennium of Catholicism with a greater determination and fervent loyalty to the Roman Catholic faith. For all things pass, but the Cross is ageless and timeless, as is God the Creator, as is His Son, the Redeemer, as is the Holy Spirit the Sanctifier—so is the soul Christian Catholic Poland.

Polonia Semper Fidelis ad eternetatem.

The Impressive Case for Two-Way Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very fine editorial on a topic in which I have a keen interest appeared in the June 29 edition of the Chicago Daily News. At the conclusion of my remarks, I would like to have the editorial included in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial makes the irrefutable point that a strong and impressive case can be made for the necessity of additional allocations of the radio spectrum to the land mobile radio service. The land mobile radio service is basically composed of two-way radio users, including many businessmen, industry, the press, as well as the police and other public service organizations.

My interest in this topic stems from my participation in hearings held May 24 of this year before the Subcommittee on Regulatory and Enforcement Agencies of the House Small Business Committee. Chaired by my very able colleague from Michigan, the subcommittee heard the witnesses testify of the many benefits they themselves derive from their use of two-way radio as well as of the benefits derived by their customers and the general public. The subcommittee members also heard the many problems these small businessmen face in their use of radio—overcrowded channels, interference from other users, and lack of action by the FCC to alleviate the congestion.

I can personally attest to the accuracy of some of the testimony we heard. I own a restaurant in Chicago, and I have freezers, refrigerators, and air-conditioning units. One night we were having trouble with these units, and I had to place a call to have them repaired. We have 24-hour repair service in Chicago and my call was immediately relayed by radio to a serviceman, and within 15 minutes he was at the restaurant door ready to go to work.

I am also interested in the use of two-way radio in police work. Since the 1920's police have had radio-equipped cars, but today's police force needs the best possible all-around communications network. I am indeed happy that Chicago has one of the finest, if not the finest, communications center of any police force in this country. Attesting to this fact, the crime rate has fallen in Chicago for the past 3 years. Last year it fell 12 percent. However, as our population grows and our cities spread over larger areas, more communications equipment will be necessary; and this means more frequencies will have to be allocated if the equipment is to be effectively utilized. Right now the police, just like the small businessman, in many cities are having trouble getting the frequencies they need.

According to the editorial, use of two-way radio increased over 600 percent since 1960. We now have 2 million licensed units, and by 1977 it is estimated that there will be 5 million.

From listening to the witnesses, personally receiving the benefits of two-way radio communications, and seeing the benefits the entire public can derive from the more effective use of two-radio communications, the public interest demands that a serious effort be made to find the additional frequencies needed and to assign them to all users on an equitable basis.

I am glad to see that this problem is finally being brought to the attention of the public through the news media. I hope other fine newspapers around the country will inform the people of the problems confronting two-way radio.

The article follows:

TWO-WAY RADIO—ITS CASE FOR NEW AIR SPACE

(By John M. Johnston)

Grant that the Electronic Industries Assn. wants to sell more two-way communication equipment, and you still have to be impressed by the case it makes for a bigger share of the radio spectrum for this use. If you think of this air space as a yardstick, then mobile, two-way radio gets less than two inches of it. The rest goes to television, radio broadcasting, air and marine navigation and long-distance telephone.

The expansion of mobile radio communication is one of the fantastic developments of our age. The list of varied users runs long, and its importance may be gauged by the multiplication of demand. Federal Communications Commission records show that for the Chicago area there are 17,461 two-way radios licensed on the channels assigned to service businesses.

For comparison, in 1960 there were 2,400 such radios on the air. That's a 600 plus-per cent increase, and the waiting lists indicate an equal growth in the next five years if the air space is available.

Everyone is familiar with the value of two-way radio to the police department, adding an efficiency to men and vehicles that would cost millions to duplicate without instant communication. With the automobile at the service of criminals, it is terrifying to imagine the problem of law enforcement without radio.

Similarly, fire fighting, whether in the city or the forest, is heavily dependent upon ability to route men and equipment quickly. Some 8,000 fire departments use radio equipment. Police agencies use nearly 200,000 two-way sets.

A few years back, if you wanted a taxicab you telephoned the nearest cab stand. If a driver was idle, he answered the phone. Nowadays a central dispatcher can instantly canvas all the cars in the area by radio and find the one soonest available. Railroads use 120,000 two-way radios, and bus lines are equally heavy users.

Truck lines have found that three radio-equipped vehicles can do the work of four, and these employ 50,000 radios. A driver can be detained or detoured to pick up a load that otherwise would require another trip.

It was only in 1959 that the FCC opened the use of two-way radio to general business organizations, but since then 400,000 vehicles have been equipped with radio.

These and other uses explain the multiplied growth of two-way radio from 86,000 licensed units in 1949 to 2,000,000 today. The industry estimates that it will grow to 5,000,000 units by 1977—provided the air space can be found.

The channels assigned to two-way radio have remained constant at 5 per cent of the total. Other users, of course, advance claims for the retention of what they have, or additions thereto. Still, in Chicago, all of the police channels are in use, barring the use of new techniques and hampering new communities in their search for efficiency.

Allocatioin of the air space is, of course, a matter of assigning priorities. There may be hope for two-way rado in sharing bands with other uses, and in technological progress that will split the channels into thinner slices.

But on the evidence of the fantastic growth in use, two-way radio is performing a service that merits a high priority in the allocation of space.

A Detroiter Looks at Auto Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Detroiters have been particularly interested in the congressional hearings on automobile safety. The following is a letter I have received from a constituent, Leon A. Rodgers, whose insight into the core of the problem is a valuable addition to this discussion:

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GRIFFITHS: The recent hearings on auto safety have greatly disturbed me. I feel that the truth on auto safety was not truly represented. On one hand we had Ralph Nader, a seemingly self-made expert, and a group of "experts"—that no one seems to have heard of either. On the other hand, we had the chiefs of the auto industry. Naturally, they're going to swear to the Almighty that safety is their only purpose and goal. It develops that no impartial, true experts were heard. I believe that true experts, policemen, race drivers, ambulance drivers, truck drivers, etc., should have been consulted.

It seems that Mr. Nader exhibited a model of a "safe" car. It had a long front. The interior had wads and wads of foam rubber; even the steering wheel was padded. I would like to point out that the "Toronado" has an elongated front. Owners complain that on hills they can't see well—the front of the car is in the line of vision. Recent newspaper articles point out that foam rubber is not really a safety feature. It does not absorb a shock extremely well; in fact, it can produce even more bouncing around. The Big Three are trying to eliminate the steering wheel altogether.

I'm not saying that "the Big 3" are not blameless. They have sacrificed good, strong suspension for a soft, smooth ride. Many a person has hit his "funny bone" on a door knob, or banged a knee on a door handle, or snagged a sleeve or a stocking on a handle. Many an unfortunate person has hit his head on a dashboard, suffering severe injuries.

Now, a bill on auto safety has come out. I ask you to consider, Congresswoman, if the bill will be really effective, will really reach to the root of traffic fatalities, the driver? Ninety percent, at least, of all accidents are the fault of the driver. More than half of there are caused by drunk drivers. Will this bill stop this problem? The little old lady from Royal Oak never drives over 35 m.p.h., even on the freeway (min. 45 m.p.h., max. 70 m.p.h.). She's never had an accident, but has caused countless others by causing traffic to jam up, drivers to cut quickly from lane to lane to get out of a rear-end collision trap. Will this bill cure this problem? A punk, speeding down a road at 90 with his lights off, trying to beat the police, swerves acoss the center line and wipes out a family in a head on collision. He'll wake up in a hospital with a broken arm, a couple of stitches, vague memory, and maybe, just maybe, a slightly guilty conscience. Will this bill cure this problem? Will this bill take the physically, mentally, and emotionally unable off the road? Will it take "Walter Mitty," the next door neighbor, who on his porch pets dogs and kisses babies but who in his car would put Jack-the-Ripper to shame, off the road? Will it take the kid down the block and his 1945 rattle and death trap off the road? (Is the auto industry responsible for a car once it sells it to a buyer? Will it take the "tail-gater" off the road? A bill that could do one of these things efficiently and practically if at all, would be a milestone in world history.

I, for one, would be sorry to see a bill telling the auto industry how to build its cars. I think that the government has too much control over private industry as it is. I recognize the fact the government controls the safety in the airline industry.

I believe that this is necessary in public transportation, but a car is a private vehicle. I would prefer, that the States get together to establish uniform traffic laws and uniform methods of testing and licensing. I think that the auto industry should be given a chance to make good its claims and prove that it is concerned with safety. Only a few major improvements are necessary—not wholesale revamping. A blanket federal law would probably cause confusion and ineffectiveness.

Sincerely,

LEON A. RODGERS.

Heart-Warming Message by an American Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a 19-year-old marine, Pfc. Stanley "Bud" Barrett recently put into words what I believe to be one of the finest commencement addresses I have read.

His was a special letter to a fifth grade graduation class in the Saginaw, Mich., Fuerbringer School. He was "adopted" by these youngsters who sent a birthday card to him earlier. Bud, son of Mr. and Mrs. Stanley G. Barrett, 1427 Brown Street, Saginaw, wrote his message from Vietnam.

I hope that every Member will read this special letter. Our Nation's future, I submit, is in strong hands with the likes of all the Bud Barretts serving their country so well.

The news article, which appeared in the June 12, 1966, edition of the Saginaw News, follows:

MARINE TELLS STUDENTS ABOUT AMERICANISM

Fifth-grade pupils normally don't hear a graduation address. They pass into the sixth grade via report cards.

The situation, however, was different this year for Mrs. Frances Clum's fifth graders at Fuerbringer School.

They heard a graduation address, even thought it wasn't called that. Principles of Americanism and the traditional advice to graduates were delivered with poignant eloquence.

The honored guest was an American Marine. He didn't appear in person because he's too busy fighting in Viet Nam. His address was conveyed by letter.

Wrote Pfc. Stanley (Bud) Barrett:

"This letter is in reply to the much-appreciated birthday card you sent. It was a very pleasant surprise.

"Our unit is located seven miles from the North Viet Nam border, the farthest north any American ground troops have gone in Viet Nam. We have 89 men in our battery. We're opposed by 2,600–2,800 Viet Cong. Nice odds, but we can call in air support if needed.

"But even if we did get killed, it would be a small price to pay for freedom. I'm willing to pay it, and so is every Marine here. We fight for what we believe in and we also believe in our own strength and skill as a fighting unit. We're the best and proud of it. We're defenders of freedom.

"You young people are the nation's future defenders. Do your part now as students so that later you may decide matters wisely, with the knowledge that many may profit through your decisions.

"One thing: No matter how smart one is with books, without common sense one is an idiot. Common sense can get you by in everyday situations, sports, business and, for me, in combat. If I went strictly by the book I'd be dead, because you can bet the Viet Cong hasn't read the same book.

"I would like to ask a small favor. Please pray for me and for others like me—that we do our job with persistent courage and never-ending faith in God. Bless you all Bud."

Pfc. Barrett is 19 years old, a 1965 graduate of St. Andrew's High School. His parents are Mr. and Mrs. Stanley G. Barrett, 1427 Brown.

Say the Barretts: "We're proud of our son—very proud."

War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, much of a critical nature has been said about the war on poverty. Generally speaking, most of the comments made by the critics have been at the carping level and supporting data has been quite minimal.

Critics of the program decry an alleged trend toward big government. But so far as I can determine, practically all of the failures have had their roots in mismanagement at the local level.

It is possible to assemble a group of interested citizens who can and will do a responsible and effective job with the resources furnished by the Federal Government. This is forcefully attested to by an article in the Creston News Advertiser which contains certain remarks by Dr. C. Edwin Gilmour at a meeting recently held in Creston, Iowa. Moreover, it also contains responses made by various citizens who are assuming their proper role of responsibility.

I submit the article for the benefit and enlightenment of my colleagues:

GILMOUR SPEAKS ON MATURA PROGRAM: DIRECTED BY LOCAL PEOPLE AT LOCAL PROBLEMS

Dr. C. Edwin Gilmour, Iowa director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, spoke to members of the board of directors of the MATURA community action program and others interested in the "war on poverty" program at a dinner meeting here last night. The dinner and meeting was held at the Inn, west of Creston, with about 65 persons present.

Dr. Gilmour was presented with a large key carved from wood and carrying a silver plaque recognizing his work in directing the "war on poverty" programs in Iowa and his help in organizing the MATURA program. The presentation was made by Fred McCard of Corning, a member of the MATURA board of directors, on behalf of the board and the community action program committees of the six counties in MATURA.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

The Iowa O.E.O. director told the group that the program should be called the Equal Opportunity Program rather than Economic Opportunity Program since the purpose is to give underprivileged Americans an equal opportunity with others.

Dr. Gilmour spoke of two misconceptions that he said many people have about the community action program. One is that it is a federal program. The other is that it is just another boondoogle or another giveaway program. Both of these ideas are wrong, he added.

Iowans, he said, have a long record of distaste for federal programs. But, he added, today we live in an era of interdependence in which individuals and communities cannot rely solely upon themselves.

LOCAL DIRECTOR

The local community, he declared, is the strength of the American Democracy. The economic opportunity program is an opportunity to recapture the sense of responsibility and helpfulness which local communities used to have.

Under the E.C.P. program, he said, local communities and local people have been assigned the most challenging problem government has ever faced. Poverty, he said, does not exist at the national or state level. It exists in the local communities and must be attacked there. Only the people in a community can grapple with it and conquer it.

The MATURA board and committees are composed of local people from the six counties—Union, Adair, Adams, Madison, Ringgold and Taylor—and the community action programs in these six counties will be planned and carried out by them.

"I know of no program in the last 50 years that is more deemphasized and which places more emphasis on the local level", Dr. Gilmour said.

FEDERAL AID

He added that the program is financed 90 percent by the federal government and 10 percent by the local groups, but added that E.C.P. is only another in a long list of federal grants-in-aid which give surplus federal funds to local communities to administer and use on the local level. "I have heard no objection", he said, "to using 90 percent federal and 10 percent state funds in the interstate highway program, but some people seem to object to use 90 percent federal funds to build people."

If the E.C.P. program succeeds, he said, it will be the people in the local community who make it succeed. If the program fails, he told the group, "you will be to blame." This program will be what you and the people in your communities make it. You can make it big or small, good or bad. It is an exciting challenge but also a responsibility. You can build a stronger, better people for a stronger, better Iowa."

POVERTY INCREASING

Dr. Gilmour said that E.C.P. is not a "something for nothing" program but a "something for something program." He pointed out that huge amounts are spent on welfare programs, which, he said, "are nothing more than a holding action." He pointed out that there were four million people on public assistance rolls in 1946 and today, after 20 years of unprecedented economic prosperity, there are eight million on the rolls. Under the minimum help philosophy under which welfare programs operate, he said, it is difficult for the people receiving welfare aid to better themselves. Their initiative, self-respect, self-confidence and hope are eroded. This philosophy has increased and perpetuated poverty. If we continue to do nothing, the problem of poverty will continue to get bigger.

But, he declared, if we explore and exploit the potential of the economic opportunity program we can cut welfare costs by one-half in 10 years. He said the economic loss from unemployment, under-employment and underprivilege has amounted to $549 billion in the last 11 years. If these people were brought back into productive economy the gains would have been tremendous. We have not been conserving our human resources but have been wasting them shamefully since the depression years. Poverty, he added, is never free or cheap. He pointed out that the Iowa legislature at its last session appropriated $61 million for public assistance programs but only made $49 million available for aid to schools.

REMEDY CONDITIONS

How can people as realistic as Americans tolerate such a condition, he asked.

In the economic opportunity program, he said, we are going to find out why people are unemployed and then remedy the condition. "Let's try to motivate the people on welfare rolls to a better life", he said. "This program", he added, "is a new concept, a new approach to human need. It gives the underprivileged an opportunity to be what their potential permits them to be. It is a program of self-analysis, self-help and self-esteem. It gives the underprivileged the equal opportunity they should have."

"This program, with your help," he told the MATURA people, "can make the American dream of equality for all a reality."

Mayor Frank Boortz of Creston spoke briefly. He commented that only through cooperation and close communication can MATURA accomplish its goal. MATURA, he said, is you. He added that he is pleased that the program is being handled by local men acquainted with local needs.

Joe Pals, director of the MATURA community action program, presided at the meeting.

Hanoi Parades Prisoners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, as the Philadelphia Inquirer sees it, the North Vietnamese Government has displayed its barbarity to the world by parading captured U.S. airmen through the streets of Hanoi.

North Vietnam's handling of the Americans is a clear violation of the Geneva Convention for Humane Treatment of War Prisoners, the Inquirer points out.

Propaganda was undoubtedly the intent of this savage reprisal, the newspaper says. But it can easily backfire. This cowardly abuse of defenseless prisoners, as the newspaper puts it editorially, and the pictures showing their mistreatment can only produce worldwide revulsion.

I consider this further evidence of the nature of freedom's enemy in southeast Asia, and ask that the editorial be entered in the Record.

Paraded Through the Streets of Hanoi

The North Vietnamese Government has displayed its barbarity to the world by parading captured American airmen through the streets of Hanoi and subjecting them to the abuse and threats of the crowds.

The pilots were handcuffed and marched under armed escort. In describing the scene, Hanoi Radio spoke of the "menacing fists and formidable screams" of the street crowds and declared that the soldier escort had to use "both words and muscles to contain the anger of the masses." It again voiced the threat to execute the prisoners as war criminals.

Hanoi's handling of the captured Americans is clearly in violation of the Geneva Convention for the humane treatment of war prisoners. The Hanoi Communists have only contempt for such restrictions on their conduct. Savage reprisal is their way of getting back at their enemies whenever they can, and they could not care less about what might happen to their own soldiers after their capture.

Hanoi undoubtedly intended the parade of the American prisoners as propaganda: to give their people a chance to vent their anger at American bombing and the individual prisoners; and to give weight to their threats to kill the captured pilots if the bombing continues.

Propaganda can hit both ways, however. In this instance, the cowardly abuse of defenseless prisoners of war, and the pictures showing their mistreatment, can only produce world-wide shock and revulsion.

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey to the U.S. Jaycees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant and illuminating speeches of the entire year was made in Detroit on June 29 by the Vice President of thet United States. Speaking before 10,000 members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce at their national convention at Cobo Hall, Vice President Humphrey emphasized, in striking manner, the thirst for individual freedom and opportunity which is surging throughout the world, the American passion for creativity and individualism which has helped write our Nation's success story, and the positive impact of American business activity overseas.

Because of the congressional recess, my colleagues may have missed this marvelous restatement of what America is all about, as well as the attendant report on the situation in Asia. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I place the Vice President's speech in the Record:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey Before the U.S. Jaycees, Detroit, Mich., June 29, 1966

Eighteen years ago, a brilliant English author named Eric Blair unleashed a nightmare vision of life in the future.

Blair foresaw endless wars among three great super-powers. Every aspect of life would be totally controlled and man would be reduced to a robot-like existence—directed in his behavior and thought-processes by an all-seeing tyrannical government.

Blair's book was a warning to mankind: Unless the course of history changed, man would be doomed by what he had created.

And unless man himself changed, he was destined to lose every trace of personal freedom and every trace of his individuality.

If this book sounds familiar, it should.

Eric Blair wrote under the pen name of George Orwell. And his book was *1984*.

We are now halfway to the year 1984—halfway to Orwell's perpetual bad dream where apathy, cruelty, and ignorance were not only dominant characteristics of life, but the aims of the state itself.

In 1948, when Orwell wrote his novel, the reign of Josef Stalin had sealed off all of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in a bleak and brutal police state, where all movements were controlled, all individuality suppressed, all thoughts suspected. Stalin himself personified Orwell's fictional dictator, Big Brother.

The world knew, in Churchill's words, "that it is only America's possession of the atomic bomb that has kept bombs from falling on London again."

Today, 18 years later, no responsible government in the world believes that war between East and West is either imminent or inevitable.

During the past 10 years alone more than 60 new countries have been born—nations which previously had not existed, except as colonial enclaves, or as tribes or protectorates.

But none has turned to communism.

Nor have the voters of any nation yet freely elected a communist regime to power. Even in Eastern Europe, monolithic control has gradually eased in favor of a system of national regimes—each increasingly following its own course.

Indeed, self-determination and national independence have domiated the post-war period.

The last 18 years have brought us many troubles, but they should nevertheless give us hope that totalitarian regimentation is not the wave of the future.

Our time is not ruled by political dogma. The great moving force in the world today is humanity's restless craving for freedom . . . for opportunity . . . for a fuller share of the blessing of life . . . above all, for a chance for individual expression and fulfillment—in short, for the very things which lie at the heart of our own American Revolution.

It is, in fact, the precepts of the American Revolution—not those of Marxism—to which the bypassed people of the world are today stirring.

The marching feet in the world today are those of people seeking freedom.

Millions of people in the world—yes, in our own country—are restlessly seeking the same freedom and well-being that you and I enjoy.

It has been said that foreign policy is really domestic policy with its hat on. In a sense, this is true.

We know that rich nations cannot be secure amid the overwhelming misery of the poor nations.

We have learned, too, that no prosperous American neighborhood can really be secure amid other neighborhoods filled with poverty and pent-up anger.

We have learned that no business can operate at maximum efficiency until those who are unemployed find work * * * that no city can provide the best in life until the worst of its slums come open to the light * * * and that our own children cannot achieve the fullness of the future until the children of others can share in it.

Some say we seek to create in America a welfare state. I think this reflects a deep misunderstanding on the part of those who say it. What we seek to create is a state of opportunity.

We seek to increase the opportunity of the individual to achieve his full potential, unhampered by ignorance, poverty and discrimination. We seek to make it possible for the individual to identify and satisfy his own aspirations.

We seek not to paralyze initiative, but to revive it; not to build up the opportunity of those below at the expense of those above—but to broaden the horizons of both; not to dictate the terms of help, but to allow each community to find its own answers in its own way.

That is what our national investments in education, in health, in the war against poverty are all about. They are investments in self-help, in personal initiative, in opportunity.

All the new laws which go under the Great Society label were written to encourage and insure the full participation and partnership of state and local governments, private organizations and individual citizens.

And I hope that many of you will read those laws, examine them, understand them, and use them to help your own communities.

All of us know that the most effective action is action at the grassroots level—and that is where we all want it to come.

No, we are not avoiding Orwellian misery by constructing a welfare utopia that would diminish human choice and incentive. Instead, we seek a course that provides growth, purpose and direction to all who are willing to grasp the chance to use their talent and energy.

Our system does not guarantee individual success. But it can—and does—provide the climate and opportunity for the individual to be himself and to go as far as his abilities allow.

Yet, I think it would be inaccurate to say that there are no challenges—in the Orwellian sense—to our freedom or to our individuality in America today.

And, as young men who are also businessmen, your responsibility in meeting these challenges is great.

For you are leaders. You are successful. And your stake in our American success is great.

The great challenge which faces us is to assure that, in our society of bigness, we do not strangle the voice of creativity . . . that the rules of the game do not come to overshadow its purpose . . . that the grand orchestration of society leaves ample room for the man who marches to the music of another drummer.

It is the businessman who, of all citizens, most clearly knows what many others but dimly see: That much of our American progress has been the product of the individual who had an idea; pursued it; fashioned it; tenaciously clung to it against all odds; and then produced it, sold it, and profited from it.

It is the businessman who knows that a society which turns away from the man who has the courage to speak the unpopular, the unfashionable, the new and the untried—that society is dissipating one of its greatest potential sources of strength.

It is an unpleasant fact that many of our most talented young people are not choosing business careers because they feel business leaves no room for individual expression or higher goals.

The word must reach our young people that business *is* a place both for individual accomplishment and for public service.

Our national growth . . . our ability to carry our responsibilities at home and in the world—these things depend on the creative and dynamic force of private initiative in our economic system.

It is part of your responsibility, as businessmen, to get this story across.

Young Americans must know that individuality and initiative are a part of the daily environment of business . . . that new ideas are greeted with enthusiasm . . . and that business is not *just* profit and loss, but also the business of the community and of responsible citizenship.

Our young people must know that business is a place "where the action is" and that it is action which benefits people and which has a place for idealism.

The story of American business is the greatest story ever told.

I work each day with Plans for Progress, an organization of private businessmen which have helped tear down barriers of domination in America, which is helping provide new opportunity to hundreds of thousands of our citizens.

I work each day with businessmen who seek to keep young Americans in school, and on the path to responsible citizenship, through summer jobs. Last year they helped provide one million jobs to young people who otherwise would have been without them.

American businessmen are leaders in our efforts today to make our cities livable . . . to preserve the natural beauty and resources of our country . . . to bring education of quality to every American child . . . to make the arts, culture and recreation an every day part of American life.

American businessmen are at work on behalf of clean and honest government. They are at work on behalf of charity and philanthropy.

And the wages and benefits they extend voluntarily to those in their employ are better than those extended by many governments known for their welfare programs.

American business has been the advanced guard, too, in many countries, of enlightened social, economic and political policy.

The present change in Western policy toward Eastern Europe—a charge which is helping to hasten the movement toward independent policies there—has been aided in no small part by the economic bridge-building of American and Western European businessmen. Businessmen, with confidence in their economic system, have moved ahead on their own initiative to open Eastern Europe to ideas, to trade, to the winds of change. And all of us are the better for it.

It is a fact, too, that American private investment in the developing countries has, in many cases, triggered changes which have not only brought economic development, but political stability and social development as well. In many places, American private investment is making possible, for the first time, large-scale development of housing . . . the building of rural schools, roads and hospitals . . . construction of fertilizer plants—the things which not only develop an economy, but also give immediate and concrete evidence that democratic government can meet the needs and aspirations of simple, ordinary people.

The so-called Adela group—a consortium of American and European businessmen—is today taking equity shares in much-needed Latin American enterprise which could not otherwise find the capital to get off the ground.

In Latin America and in other parts of the world, hundreds of private American investors are today providing capital—to places starved for capital—for economic and social projects. And I might add that your government backs them up with guarantees.

And there is the personal commitment, too, of American businessmen who know that the labors of one man can make a difference.

There are the efforts of American small businessmen in Tunisia, teaching their counterparts there how to sell a better product, provide a better service, make a profit.

There are the efforts of the men and women of the International Executive Service Corps—retired American business executives—who are giving several months out of their lives to help enterprises get started in Latin America and in Southeast Asia.

All these things not only strengthen nations desperately in need of help . . . they strengthen the fabric of freedom. They show that there does not have to be a big brother to get things done. They show that free men, working together, can do far more than any totalitarian system giving orders.

Your own Project ACTT train and the Jaycees International Movement exemplify the spirit with which business has met the opportunities of international service.

And all of us are in debt to men who have, at personal sacrifice, left the world of business to enter the public service at local, state and national level.

American businessmen are indeed where the action is. And, for the good of men everywhere I hope they will remain there.

It is part of the good news of the day that our free economic system—and the people who make it work—is not only providing profits, it is providing life and hope to the family of man.

Now, finally, it is my responsibility as your Vice President to give you a report, as of today, about where we stand in Asia and in Vietnam.

I say Asia and Vietnam, because we cannot see Vietnam as a vacuum, unconnected to its neighbors or the rest of the world.

When I returned from Asia and the Pacific earlier this year, I reported to the American people that I believed we had reason for measured optimism. I believe that this is more true today than it was then.

Last week, nine nations of Asia formed a new organization to be known as the Asian and Pacific Council. This organization was formed to strengthen these nations cooperation and peaceful development, but also—as the final communique put it—"To preserve their integrity and sovereignty in the face of external aggression."

This is but one of the things that can give us reason for encouragement.

Faced with communist pressure, the independent noncommunist states in Asia are working together to strengthen themselves and to inoculate themselves against aggression. Old quarrels and disagreements are being pushed aside and the nations of Asia and the Pacific are banding together—and among those banding together are nations which have traditionally taken go-it-alone positions.

Communist China still looms as a powerful force in Asia. But today Communist China is being torn by power struggle—a struggle with other communist nations, a struggle, too, from within. At the same time, her neighbors are achieving a unity of purpose and action that was missing before.

For, as the President of Singapore made clear a few days ago to the people of Europe—all the independent nations of Asia feel the pressure from the North—all of them feel they have a stake in what is happening in Vietnam.

On my Asian mission, I talked with no national leader who felt otherwise.

What of the immediate struggle in Vietnam.

That struggle is being waged on four fronts—the economic front . . . the political front . . . the diplomatic front . . . and the military front.

On each of these fronts we are gaining. And our efforts on these fronts are increasingly being coordinated, in proper balance.

On the economic front, the Vietnamese government, with our help, is taking the hard steps and decisions necessary not only to carry forward a program of economic development, but to defeat inflation—which can destroy economic progress.

The devaluation announced June 19 has not resulted in any sharp increase in prices. The price of retail items, including the critical price of rice, has steadied off. The prices of fish, chicken, charcoal and firewood—all critical to the economy—have fallen. Import prices are steady.

In the meantime, the hard day-to-day work of building a strong economy—the hard work that never makes the daily headlines—goes on in the Vietnamese cities and countryside.

Land is being redistributed. Wells are being dug. Schools are being built. Agricultural production steadily increases. Hospitals and roads are being completed.

These things are not dramatic. But every day the Vietnamese economy—and the life of the Vietnamese citizen—becomes a little better than it was the day before, despite calculated communist disruption and terror.

On the political front, work goes forward toward election this September for a constituent assembly. Representatives of all South Vietnamese political groups have been meeting to prepare the way for democratic government.

This is a nation which has undergone centuries of foreign rule and oppression. This is a nation with no comfortable, built-in republican and democratic parties. This is a nation trying to create stable, representative government in the midst of war and disorder. This is a nation with dozens of political, ethnic and religious groups—all seeking their own place in the future.

If this process should bring conflict and confusion, it should not surprise us.

The important fact is that the Vietnamese people are finding their way toward nationhood, and that they are doing it their own way and not under the direction of any communist commisar.

I think there is another thing to remember—in all the political ferment in South Vietnam there has been no call for a communist government.

The people of South Vietnam know the communists for what they are. And they know the so-called national liberation front for what it is—a front, for Ho Chi Minh and a communist takeover.

As on the economic front, the progress is slow and sometimes unnoticeable. But it is there, day-by-day. The time is near when the people of South Vietnam will show their commitment to democracy with their ballots. Many of them will be threatened with violence and even death, but they will vote. And I predict that the percentage of South Vietnamese who will vote—in face of these threats—will exceed the percentages in many of our American towns and cities.

On the diplomatic front, we continue our search for a just and peaceful solution to the conflict.

In these past weeks, we have repeated our message again and again—through diplomatic channels, through third parties, through public statement, through private and official sources—our willingness to come to the conference table to bring the violence to an end.

Although we have met with nothing but rebuff, we shall continue these efforts. And we shall maintain our offer to aid in the peaceful development of North as well as South Vietnam if only Hanoi will leave her neighbors alone.

At the same time, we have reaffirmed throughout Asia and the Pacific, our commitment to the security and economic growth of that part of the world. And we have reaffirmed our commitment to stand and see it through in Vietnam.

I believe that the depth of our commitment has been one of the major factors in the development of the regional cooperation and spirit of common cause we now see in Asia and the Pacific.

The purpose of our diplomacy has been, and will remain, the end of the fighting . . . the establishment of conditions under which the people of South Vietnam can freely choose their own future . . . and the gathering together of the resources of all nations to make life better for the by-passed millions who have waited for centuries in Asian village streets.

On the military front, we are gaining, too, each day.

The American troops in Vietnam are the finest men who have ever worn this nation's uniform. They are superbly led. They are superbly trained. They are superbly equipped. And their performance has been superb.

With our allies, they have inflicted in these past weeks a series of defeats on both Guerrilla and regular North Vietnamese units.

They have done nothing less than this—they have caused our adversary to re-examine all his old assumptions about "wars of national liberation."

The jungle or cave is no longer his sure refuge. His movement can no longer remain undetected. His supply can be cut off. The attacks he begins at great numerical advantage can become, in a matter of minutes, a disastrous defeat as he faces unexpected reinforcements and firepower. He can no longer choose his own time and place to fight.

And, perhaps most important, he can no longer count on the discipline of his own troops.

In the last six months of 1965, more than 8,000 communist defectors left his ranks. In the first five months of this year, he has lost more than 11,000 defectors—and more and more of them have been squad and platoon leaders and officers.

Today there must be some hard thinking taking place in Hanoi.

Today Ho Chi Minh is in Peking. Other officials of his government are in Moscow.

I think it must be clear to Hanoi that what President Johnson said more than a year ago remains true today.

"We will not be defeated.

"We will not grow tired.

"We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement . . ."

Our adversary must know that time is not on his side.

He must know that we will not sacrifice small nations for the sake of our own comfort.

He must know that we—and those who stand with us—count freedom no less sacred elsewhere than we do at home.

He must know, above all, that the American people have the resources, the vision, the courage, and the endurance to see it through for what we believe in.

Finally, may I say this.

The Alien fields of Vietnam will not be our final testing place between now and the year 1984.

There will be other tests . . . there will be other challenges on man's path toward a future of his own making.

Let us recognize, today, that the future lies in large part on our own American doorstep.

For our American wealth and power—our power to shape the course of events for good—is unparalleled in the history of the world.

More than any other people on earth, the American people have the means today to determine what kind of world it will be in 1984.

It is our opportunity—and our responsibility—to do whatever is within our power to see that 1984 does not bring stifling confromity and slavery. It must be our mission to see that 1984 will be a time when human freedom and human dignity may come to shining reality.

H.R. 4671

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks I have received a deluge of mail from my constituents in southeast Iowa expressing a great concern for the proposals contained in H.R. 4671 to authorize the construction of two dams in the Grand Canyon area. I believe that the sentiments stated in a letter to me from Dr. Donald B. McDonald of the Department of Civil Engineering, University of Iowa, Iowa City, present most clearly and concisely the sound reasons why this proposal should be defeated:

JUNE 13, 1966.

Hon. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you to voice my objections to the proposed Marble Gorge and Bridge Canyon Dams which are included in the Colorado River Bill (H.R. 4671) which is now before the House Interior Committee.

In 1958 I directed pre-impoundment studies on the Colorado River in the Glen Canyon area for the Utah Fish and Game Department, and thus have some first-hand knowledge of the situation on the Colorado River. I do not feel that this project is justified from the reclamation standpoint, but more important, I feel the damage to the recreational and scenic resources of the Colorado River, one of the last great unspoiled rivers in the country, would be immeasurable. Not only would the impounded water invade the Grand Canyon recreational area and seriously damage the scenic beauty of one of our few remaining wilderness areas, but the fluctuation in water level and the changed environment which result from the formation of a reservoir of this sort would destroy much of the unique biota of this area. This loss becomes particularly significant when one considers the rapidly increasing population and the critical need for adequate unspoiled recreational areas.

I am well aware of the critical water problems which exist in the Far West, but I feel that solutions are possible which do not result in destruction of irreplaceable scenic resources.

Yours very truly,
DONALD B. MCDONALD, Ph. D.,
Associate Professor, Civil Engineering,
University of Iowa.

Internal Revenue Agitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the efforts to inform the public about proposals to dam the Grand Canyon have been challenged by the Internal Revenue Service in an unprecedented action.

If this move were effective in cowing the various conservation organizations, the reclamation lobby would be unhampered in its attempts to foist on my colleagues the proposals for Bridge Canyon—or Hualapai—and Marble Gorge Dams in the Grand Canyon.

I hope that conservationists will continue to defend the Grand Canyon from these ill-advised proposals.

An editorial in Sports Illustrated of June 27, 1966, deals with this subject, and I offer it as part of my remarks:

A Risk Well Taken

On June 9 the Sierra Club, the nation's largest and most eminent conservation group, ran full-page ads in *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* importuning readers to protest two proposed dams which the club feels would irrevocably alter and ruin the "essence and excellence" of the Grand Canyon.

Less than 24 hours later the Internal Revenue Service, in a wholly unprecedented move, advised the club that it could no longer be assured that its donations would be tax deductible. The IRS claimed that the club *may* have violated the section of its code denying tax-exempt status to organizations which devote a "substantial" part of their activities to attempts to influence legislation.

Although it is generally believed that the Sierra Club's "lobbying" amounts to less than 1% of its total activities and expenditures, and although the IRS is unable to come up with any figure or percentage defining "substantial," the club may well lose a good deal of revenue before the IRS gets around to auditing its books, and making some sort of ruling.

Undeniably, tax exemption is a privilege that shouldn't be abused, but it appears, in this instance, that the IRS proceeded with excessive zeal and haste. Furthermore, its action is an intolerable perversion of one of the principles of justice—that one is not punished before guilt is determined.

It also seems unreasonable that the Reclamation Bureau can, with impunity, lobby for the dams at the taxpayers' expense while the Sierra Club is not permitted to combat effectively what it believes to be against the public interest.

"We saw that there was risk," says David Brower, executive secretary of the Sierra Club, "but the risk to our solvency is much less important than the risk to the land. We're going to continue defending Grand Canyon, and we're hoping that enough citizens will care enough to help keep us afloat."

An Act To Adjust the Rates of Basic Compensation of Certain Employees of the Federal Government

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides an across-the-board salary increase averaging 2.9 percent for postal workers and other Federal employees. This is a very modest pay boost considering the rise in the cost of living that has occurred since the last Federal salary increase in October 1965.

The Congress in 1962 pledged that Federal salary rates shall be comparable with those paid by private enterprise for the same levels of work. President Johnson strongly affirmed this principle of comparability when, in a message to Congress on May 12, 1965, he declared:

> We do not have two standards of what makes a good employer in the United States: One standard for private enterprise and another for the Government. A double standard which puts the Government employee at a comparative disadvantage is short-sighted. In the long run, it costs more.

Yet, despite the increases voted last year and in the bill we are considering today, the salaries paid to Federal employees continue to lag behind the rates paid for comparable work in private industry.

My colleagues will recall that last year the original House bill provided for a 4 percent first-step increase effective in 1965 and a second step adjustment to become effective a year later. The amount of the second-step adjustment was to be determined according to a special formula designed to bring Federal employees' salaries into closer relationship with those paid in private industry. However, the Senate reduced the 1965 increase from 4 to 3.6 percent and eliminated the 1966 second-stage increase altogether.

The reason given last year for reducing the increase voted by the House is the same reason given this year for not making a greater effort to close the gap between the salaries of Government employees and their counterparts in private industry: the threat of a Presidential veto if the increase exceeds the administration wage-price guidelines.

The Consumer Price Index was 110.4 in October 1965. Within 6 months the index jumped 1.9 percent to 112.5. So the purchasing power of the 2.9-percent increase we are voting today is actually only about 1 percent, minus Federal, State, and local taxes, civil service retirement deductions, and life insurance premiums.

I do not intend to be critical of either our own Post Office and Civil Service Committee or the corresponding committee of the other body. They have both been as generous toward the Federal employee as could reasonably be expected of them in view of the wage guidelines which the administration appears to be applying more rigidly to Federal employees than to those who can bargain collectively with private employers.

The fringe benefit features of the final version of H.R. 14122—including more liberal retirement provisions, increased Government contribution to the cost of health insurance, overtime pay and increased annuities for certain overtime pay and certain annuity increases—bring the cost to slightly more than the administration's wage guidepost figure.

To do less, as the Senate committee's report so well concludes, "would be to do practically nothing at all."

Disclosures of the Week—Part IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, hereinafter is recent information that has come to my attention and which it seems to me should cause concern to the American public.

CASE I

Tax Foundation, Inc., in June 1966 reported to its members that estimated Federal civilian employment at the end of April was 2,644,244, an increase of 33,464 for that month alone. The U.S. Civil Service Commission was quoted as indicating Federal employment will further increase by 100,000 by 1969.

CASE II

According to an article by William Beecher in the July 10 New York Times, despite optimistic declarations about Vietnam war prospects by President Johnson and others, the administration is quietly starting another major expansion of the Armed Forces. By the end of the year the 280,000-man force currently in South Vietnam will have increased to 375,000 by yearend and to 425,000 by next spring.

The Times itself in the same edition said supply problems in Vietnam are being overcome. But it added that lack of candor by the Johnson administration and the attempt to hide problems is unfair to the military.

CASE III

The Scripps-Howard roundup which appeared in the June 4 Washington Daily News said the Johnson administration has a hush-hush policy on prices. It said Cabinet members, economists, statisticians all have been told to soft-pedal prices and inflation which this newspaper pointed out are political dynamite.

CASE IV

According to a recent report of the Senate minority policy committee, the civil service retirement fund has $15 billion in investments. Income from this investment, plus Government contributions, keep the outgo current, but by 1970 the outflow will exceed cash receipts. On an accrual basis, there is an arrearage in the capital account of about $40 billion. Congress is obligated to vote funds to pay retirement benefits to civil employees.

CASE V

Under the title of "Politics in Poverty," the July 1 Washington Daily News described job security in a federally financed Kentucky coal area poverty program as conditioned on political kinships or economic interest to the county's Democratic courthouse machine.

CASE VI

Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense, according to a letter published in the Nation, berated a Washington, D.C., professor who in a broadcast pointed out that weekly figures on American deaths in Vietnam do not include casualties from disease, air accidents, and the like. In the past, when Sylvester did not approve of newsmen he threatened to go to their editors; in this case he carried his protest to the president of the university where the professor teaches.

CASE VII

The Department of Agriculture placed a rush order for 2,900 special typewriters which cost more than $500 each. Due to the rush, the Department was spending $1,500,000, or $500,000 more than the cost would have been if it had taken competitive bids.

According to the Agricultural Stabilization Service the rush was to meet a deadline of January 1, 1967, for reporting of farmers' payments. What the Department overlooked was that an amendment establishing the deadline had been defeated and was not in the law.

CASE VIII

Not long ago an article in U.S. News & World Report said antipoverty funds granted to Syracuse University were used, in part, to hire baby sitters and pay taxi fares to transfer people from heavy Democratic public housing areas to voter registration centers in the city.

CASE IX

A recent Gallup poll reported that 41 percent of the population lists crime as the greatest domestic problem in America. Some 51 percent of those polled believe that the problem had worsened in the last 5 years.

Statistics bear out this worry. In a report on June 20, 1966, the U.S. Department of Justice revealed that crime increased 6 percent in the first 3 months of 1966. The increase was led by a 14-percent rise in forcible rape, 11 percent rise in larceny, 9 percent in aggravated assault, 5 percent in auto theft, with murder, robbery, and burglary each chalking up 4-percent gains.

CASE X

An editorial in the June issue of a trade magazine, Welding Engineer, mentions a program of the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity. It criticizes the program's cost of $16,000 to train four welders but especially is critical because the students only received training in one kind of welding. It points this up as an example of Government getting into some areas about which it knows little or nothing, and wonders why a welding school has to be set up in a city that already has two of the best privately operated welding schools with experienced teachers in the country.

National Cemetery Sought for Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, early in this Congress I introduced a bill (H.R. 5763) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Ohio. Several of my colleagues have introduced identical bills. So far no action has been taken by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs because of the administration policy opposing further expansion of our national cemetery system. It becomes more apparent each day that it is going to be necessary to change this policy if we are to fulfill our obligations to veterans and their families.

One of my constituents, Mr. Nunzio R. Calvo, commander of American Legion Post 74 of Cleveland and commissioner of the Soldiers' Relief Commission of Cuyahoga County has worked tirelessly to obtain a national cemetery for Ohio. There is none in our State at present, although we have the fifth largest veteran population in the Nation. In view of this, I am hopeful that we will be successful in obtaining favorable action by the Congress on the proposed legislation.

As part of my remarks I include a letter written to Mr. Calvo by Maj. Gen. Erwin C. Hostetler, the adjutant general of Ohio, and an article from the Cleveland Press of May 9, 1966, entitled "National Cemetery Sought for Ohio":

STATE OF OHIO,
ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT,
Columbus, Ohio, May 4, 1966.

Hon. N. R. CALVO,
Commander, American Legion Post No. 74,
Soldiers Relief Commission,
Cleveland, Ohio.

DEAR MR. CALVO: Your letter of 13 April 1966, addressed to Governor Rhodes, has been handed to me for reply.

I have studied your proposal for creation of a national military cemetery in Ohio. It does appear that there exists a very logical basis for the establishment of such a cemetery in Ohio. I note that our neighboring States of Indiana, Kentucky, and West Virginia each have one or more national military cemeteries still open for veteran burials.

There appears to be no valid rationale against creating a national military cemetery in our State, especially in view of our total war veteran population of 1,212,000. I note that only 4 States (California, Illinois, New York, and Pennsylvania) have larger veteran populations than Ohio. Of further interest is the fact that in California there are 3 national cemeteries; in Illinois, 5; in New York, 3; and in Pennsylvania, 2.

As you stated, veteran deaths in Ohio averaged 843 per month during Fiscal Year 1965, and have been rising at a rate of almost 200 per month for the last few years. A projection of these data indicates that, barring future large-scale hostilities, a peak in veteran deaths should occur in about 15 to 18 years, when the average age of our World War II veterans approaches 65.

I see no reason why our veterans should be denied the privilege of burial in a national military cemetery in their own State, if they so desire. I shall recommend to Governor Rhodes that he extend Ohio's full support to your project.

A copy of this letter will be transmitted to all Ohio Senators and Congressmen; to the President; and to the Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Sincerely yours,
Maj. Gen. ERWIN C. HOSTETLER,
The Adjutant General.

NATIONAL CEMETERY SOUGHT FOR OHIO

(By James Johnson)

COLUMBUS.—It is the right of every honorably discharged veteran to be buried in a national cemetery.

And Ohio officials are asking the federal government to establish a national cemetery somewhere in the state.

There are no national cemeteries in Ohio, even though the fifth largest veteran population in the U.S. lives here.

Records show veterans currently are dying in Ohio at the rate of 843 per month. And in 15 to 18 years, when the average age of World War II veterans reaches 65, the rate will top 2000 per month.

So far, any veteran who exercises his right to a free burial plot in a national cemetery has had to accept the fact it would be in another state.

Agitation for a national cemetery in Ohio started with N. R. Calvo of Cleveland, commissioner and American Legion representative on the Soldiers Relief Commission.

Calvo checked the statistics on the veteran population and death rate with the Adjutant General's Department, then wrote Governor Rhodes, urging him to do what he could to secure a cemetery.

Calvo explained that only California, New York, Illinois and Pennsylvania have more resident veterans than Ohio.

California and New York have three national cemeteries each, Illinois has five and Pennsylvania has four.

Even Texas, which has fewer veterans than Ohio, has three national cemeteries.

Calvo suggested a national cemetery could be on a 500-acre portion of the Ravenna Arsenal. Rhodes turned down this suggestion. He wants the site for an industrial park.

"Right now we are casting around for a suitable site," said John M. McElroy, Rhodes' top aide.

"It should be somewhere which is convenient. Perhaps we might select a site in connection with a state park—somewhere that would be scenic but where people wouldn't necessarily trample the graves.

"We are open to suggestions," he said.

Private Enterprise and International Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a recent editorial from the Bristol Virginia-Tennessean, which pays tribute to the accomplishments of private enterprise as a booster of sound and helpful international relations:

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS BOOST

The history of the Arabian American Oil Company is an inspiring chapter in international relations. Aramco, as it is called, is a major American oil company that many years ago pioneered in developing petroleum production in Saudi Arabia. A recent review of Aramco's 1965 operations tells a story of commercial and cultural progress that would be hard to equal. In that year alone, the company and its employes spent about $117.5 million in Saudi Arabia for materials, services, personal taxes and welfare.

The rising rate of the company's operations contributed directly and indirectly to the progress of the economy in Saudi Arabia, particularly in the fields of commerce, health, education and agriculture.

Company agriculturists assisted farmers in increasing food production. Assistance was also given in land reclamation, development of medical services and water resources. In short, the story of Aramco in Arabia is a story of an advancing civilization.

Private enterprise has brought progress to an area that otherwise would have very likely been officially classified as one of the underdeveloped nations—eligible for help from American taxpayers. Incidentally, it is the same kind of private enterprise that we see all around us in our own country—paying taxes to support government, employing millions of people, producing goods and services in astronomical quantities. The underdeveloped nation is a nation without private enterprise.

Headmaster Frank Boyden of Deerfield—Part VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, for the past week or so, I have been pleased to insert in the RECORD segments of a lengthy biographical profile from the pages of the New Yorker magazine about Headmaster Frank Boyden of Deerfield Academy.

I have done so in the belief that the story concerns not only a great American life, but a great American institution. It has been the story where the energies and passion of a single man, seemingly frail and physically slight, were almost solely responsible for the growth and development of both the academy and the historic community in which it stands.

Frank Boyden is the only headmaster Deerfield Academy has ever known. He came to the school 64 years ago, when it was a crumbling country public school of uncertain future. Harboring private plans for an altogether different career, Frank Boyden began to build and to mold the school. Without really realizing it, Frank Boyden was making a lifetime commitment to an ideal—and he has lived and worked to see it come to full fruition.

Under unanimous consent procedure, I am pleased to place in the RECORD at this point a final segment of that profile. It brings the article to a close by bringing us up to date on the lifework of Frank Boyden.

Although this excerpt concludes the New Yorker profile of the headmaster, the story has no end. In spite of his 86 years, Frank Boyden continues to lead his charges at Deerfield, continues to seek funds whenever and wherever he can to perpetuate his school, and continues to maintain a pace in both work and play that would have stopped a less dedicated, less courageous, less devoted man many years ago.

I respectfully commend the story of Headmaster Frank Boyden to the attention of my colleagues, and to the American people.

The excerpt follows:

THE HEADMASTER—VIII

The headmaster wakes up from his midday nap and decides to take a quick look around the school before lunch. He believes correctly that the more people see of him—students and faculty alike—the more smoothly his school will run. "You won't see any confusion anywhere, I'm sure," he says. (Recently, he was scheduled to go on a complicated journey from Deerfield to Worcester to Chicago and back to Deerfield. He went to Worcester but decided to backtrack to Deerfield. It was 5 p.m. when he reached the campus, and at that time the greatest concentration of students happened to be in the gymnasium. He walked into the gym, stayed two minutes, walked out of the building, and went on to Chicago.

Getting into his golf cart, he shoots at full throttle along Albany Road, which goes through the center of the campus and forms a right angle with the long town street. He loops, twists, drives with his hands off the wheel, dives downhill, shaves trees, goes up the left side of the street into oncoming traffic, and waves and honks to people without regard to obstacles rapidly approaching. He has never actually known how to drive a car, but he used to swirl around Deerfield in an old Pontiac he had, going everywhere at top speed in second gear, because that was the only gear he knew how to find. People learned to get out of his way then. Today, although the golf cart is less alarming, everyone remains alert. He goes out onto his baseball field, spins around second base, and looks back at the academy. "Let's not be boastful, but let's be thankful for what we've got," he says. "Isn't it beautiful? We didn't have anything for so long that we had years and years to think of what we would like. I go around as often as I can to make sure it's still there. This is the kind of day when you get the shadows on the hills and the mist on the river. I've been so fortunate all my life to live in the country."

He sees the coach of Junior A soccer and drives about three hundred yards to intercept him and tell him how he wants the reception after the Junior A soccer game a few hours hence to be run. "I like receptions run better than they have been this fall," he says. "I don't like boys getting loose in the store and then wandering into receptions with ice-cream cones." He drives over to the Memorial Building, where the reception will be held, for he wants to make sure that everything has been properly set out. Before he goes in, he removes the keys to the golf cart and puts them into his pocket.

On his way out, he wipes a bit of dust off a windowsill. He goes to the gymnasium and downstairs to the football locker room, where he weighs himself. One hundred and forty-four. He is pleased. He notices the blackboard: "Beat Worcester—they'll be tougher this year." "That's high-school stuff," he says, and he erases the sentiment from the board. On the front steps of the gym, he picks up a crushed, lipstick-smeared cigarette butt and carries it back into the building as if it were a dead rat. He puts it in a wastebasket, straightens a bench, and goes home to have lunch with his wife.

After another nap, he gives an hour-long tour of the school to an alumnus from Michigan who has returned, with his wife and son, after a long absence. Then he gets into his Cadillac and departs for Amherst, where he has an appointment. The car is driven by Foster F. Babineau, who is known as Fuzzy and is in his late fifties, Fuzzy's predecessor in the job was his father-in-law. On major highways, the headmaster sometimes gets out a stopwatch and times Fuzzy as he sails past the mileposts. If his calculations don't please him, he tells Fuzzy to speed it up. In twenty-three years, the headmaster has never told Fuzzy to slow down. "And, boy," says Fuzzy, "have we had some pretty good rides!" The headmaster will get into the car in Deerfield and tell Fuzzy what time he has to be where. Then it is up to Fuzzy to get him there, even if the destination happens to be more miles away than there are minutes left before the appointment. It was the same way with Fuzzy's father-in-law. In those days, the headmaster often used a train called the Minute Man for his longer trips, but, of course, he had to catch it.

The Minute Man's route went along the base of the hills to the west of the school, across the river. The headmaster would wait until it went by, then go out and jump in the car and tell Fuzzy's father-in-law to go after it. Sometimes they caught the train at the next stop, sometimes two stops down the line, but it never got away. The night of the Brink's robbery, in 1950, a squadron of state policemen closed in on the Cadillac, waved Fuzzy over, and told him to get out, because they were going to investigate the car. The headmaster was asleep, but he sat up and said, "Tell them to go away." They went away. Fuzzy spends more time with the headmaster than anyone else does. "He's never given me hell for anything," Fuzzy says. "If that isn't a record, I don't know. God knows he could have. You know, weather has never questioned that man. We're left Deerfield in blizzards. He's a corker. He's drier than a covered bridge."

The headmaster's appointment is at Amherst's new Robert Frost Library, where he has asked Deerfield's architect, William Platt, to meet him and talk about Deerfield's new library, which will incorporate similar features. He points out to the architect what an exciting opportunity this is to create something unparalleled among facilities at secondary schools. Then he tells the architect exactly how he wants each element to be done. He returns to Deerfield and has dinner with three young admissions men from Harvard. He reminisces about his friend Dean Pennypacker, their distinguished predecessor, who died before they were born. At half past six, the faculty fills up the headmaster's living room, having afterdinner coffee. On some occasions during this daily event, the headmaster has clapped his hands and told everyone to be sure to go to the town hall and vote on zoning, or a bond issue, or whatever happens to be going on in politics in the valley. If the headmaster is an educator by intuition, he is a politician by instinct.

While he was building his school, he built himself into a political force incomparably more powerful than the headmaster of any school would be simply by virtue of his position. Boyden started by going around to church suppers all over the area. Then he served for years as town constable; he represented the district at state conventions; and he opened up his academy for the use of the community. Every three or four weeks, for decades, a banquet has been held there for hundreds of people—Red Cross, county assessors, Community Fund, a tool company's annual blast. The headmaster charges little or nothing. Once a month, the village Men's Club eats gluttonous slabs of roast beef for fifty cents apiece. At Commencement time, the great academy dinner is open to anyone from anywhere, and hundreds of people come.

The headmaster is paying them back. When he had no money, the great academy dinner was prepared by the farmers' wives, who brought the food with them. During the First World War, the academy boys saved local businessmen by unloading freight cars, and throughout the Second World War they picked potatoes. The headmaster constantly repeats to his boys the theme of responsibility to the community, of the need for all of them to become engaged citizens. From this base he has risen to be "the master politician in western Massachusetts," as one man in Greenfield puts it, going on to say, "All people in this part of the state consult him when they are thinking of running for office." A Massachusetts state policeman once said, "The headmaster is the only person of importance around here who calls us all by our first names."

In 1959, when Nelson Rockefeller was trying to decide whether to seek the Republican nomination for President, he invited ten men from New England to a meeting in New York. Boyden was one of the ten—and not because Rockefeller had earlier sent two sons to Deerfield. The will of Charles Merrill was a complicated one—it involved payments to Deerfield, Amherst, and other institutions, spread out over many years—and a tax ruling was made that was unfavorable to the beneficiaries. They stood to lose millions, and the only way to change the situation was through an Act of Congress. The possibility of such legislation was considered nil by everyone but the headmaster, so one day in 1957 Boyden went alone to Washington. He was there only long enough to look up his contacts in Congress, the Senate, the Cabinet, and the White House. The bill was written and passed.

The headmaster recently moved a proposed alignment for an interstate highway with a flick of his elbow. No one knows the number of people in the valley who are wholly or partly supported by him, but no one doubts that it is considerable. His charitable instincts have never been reckless, however. In 1940, a man in Greenfield wrote to the headmaster, told him that he was out of money, winter was coming, his children were sick, and he would be immeasurably grateful if the headmaster could send him two tons of coal. The headmaster sent him one ton of coal.

September 29, 1955.

Dear Sherm: I am sorry about the President's Birthday Party, for we had such a good time at the one in Pennsylvania.

February 7, 1959.

Dear President Eisenhower: Thank you for your letter. As always I am very grateful to you for the appointment to the Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission. . . . I think back with much pleasure to the half-hour which you gave me when you took one minute to say you could not come to Deerfield and then suggested that since we had twenty-nine minutes left we talk about something in which we were both interested and experienced—namely, the seventeen to eighteen year old boy. I was also very glad that you and Mrs. Eisenhower used my cart for the Birthday Celebration in Hershey.

September 24, 1957.

Dear Nelson: This is a letter which does not require an answer, but I did want to tell you how interested I am in your efforts to keep the Dodgers in Brooklyn.

December 15, 1923.

Dear Father Sullivan: I have just been looking at the Greenfield *Recorder* for December 8th, and have seen the notice of your ordination to the priesthood. Please accept my hearty congratulations on the completion of your studies. I am always very much interested in the progress of any of the boys from this section with whom I have been associated in athletics and otherwise. I always felt during your connection with the high school in Turners Falls that you had real power of leadership.

Tonight, in place of the ordinary Evening Meeting, a visiting alumnus is going to describe to the boys his experiences, swimming under the ice in the Antarctic and recording the sounds of seals. The headmaster talks first, telling the boys how nice it is to have alumni return, especially from such remote and unusual places, and as he goes on in this vein he is before his school in his most characteristic attitude. He has gripped both lapels of his double-breasted jacket, and he draws them together as if he were cold. He wrinkles his nose. He has a smile on his face, and he interrupts himself with soft, inaudible laughter. He sits down to hear the lecture, resting one ankle on the other knee.

After the evening study period, the headmaster's living room fills up again—this time with varsity athletes, who have come for milk, crackers, and a blackboard talk by the coach. The coach is modern, very able, and technical. The headmaster adds a few words that are not even faintly technical. These brief evening gatherings of football, basketball, and baseball players have been going on at the headmaster's house for about fifty years. When the boys have gone, he sits down, puts his ankle up on his knee, and says, "I don't feel any less power or any less vigor than I did forty years ago. I'm hoping to be able to have three more years."

In the late nineteen-thirties, some prospective Deerfield parents hesitated before sending their sons to Deerfield because they thought that the headmaster, being close to sixty, might be nearing the end of his career. Among these was Henry N. Flynt, who did decide to send his son to Deerfield and is now the chairman of the academy's board of trustees and the head of the foundation that has financed the preservation of many Deerfield houses. The headmaster himself, in the nineteen-thirties, said to a member of his faculty, "One of the things I regret is that I am not going to live long enough to see how Deerfield boys do." In the mid-forties, the headmaster began saying, "If I can only have five more years . . ."—a stock preamble to a discussion of his plans of the moment. He used this same line through the nineteen-fifties and the early sixties.

Now, in his living room, he repeats, "I'm hoping to be able to have three more years. I'd like five, but I'm very conscious of my age. Look, I'm not selfish about it. I'm not going to bother anybody by hanging on too long, but I would like to see the library finished. Perhaps I will have to retire someday, but I'm not setting any definite date."

The headmaster recently wrote a long, discursive letter to all Deerfield alumni and parents in which he obscurely used the word "retire." Hundreds of eloquent testimonials and thousands of dollars arrived by return mail. Answering the letters, he thanked everyone and assured them that he had no intention whatever of retiring. "I've got to do an awful lot in three years, if I can," he says. "I have a feeling that if you've got something good enough to be preserved, it will be. I just kept working. I have never had time enough to concentrate on any one difficulty. The thing I have tried to build is a unity of feeling. The thing I hope is always retained here is the school's flexibility. We've just kept abreast of the times. We haven't gone wild. There's a sense of permanence in the school." He looks with surprise at some notes about the academy that were written by him in 1906. They have been filed away for sixty years, and he has forgotten that they existed. "The object of the school should be the development of character, to help each pupil to do that for which he is best suited," he reads. "This can be done in the country, because the comparatively small numbers make it possible to do much personal work, and the relationship between pupil and teacher becomes more intimate."

"Not bad," he says. "I was ahead of things, wasn't I? I didn't know I could do it."

—John McPhee.

Support for Our Fighting Men in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the 1966 graduating class of George W. Wingate High School, in the finest spirit of our American tradition, has dedicated its yearbook in the following manner:

> In this world of conflicting ideas, may this book be a symbol of friendship to be cherished in the years to come.
>
> As we recall the events that shaped the world during our years at Wingate, we will remember those who fought for the ideals they believed in.
>
> We the graduating class of 1966 dedicate our yearbook to the troops in Vietnam, and hope that some day all people may be free and at peace.

I know that all of the Members of the Congress join with the graduating seniors of Wingate in their desire for a lasting peace.

The yearbook called Mosaic, 1966 is, indeed, a fine literary and artistic piece of work.

An interesting innovation is the insert in the back of the book containing the school songs in print and on a disc record.

The school principal and faculty and more especially the faculty adviser, Samuel B. Koltun, have every right to be proud. Their students reflect credit upon their teaching by this accomplishment. Congratulations to them and to the entire student body.

Stockholders Should Wake Up!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1966

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial written by Mr. Floyd Souders, editor of the Cheney Sentinel. I commend Mr. Souders' timely and pertinent article to my colleagues and other interested persons who read the Congressional Record.

STOCKHOLDERS SHOULD WAKE UP!

The people are the stockholders in the greatest corporation in the world, the U.S. government. Just as in a business corporation, they elect the officers and directors of the "company." If the officers of our government corporation spend its money faster than income and good business practice warrant, it is up to the stockholders (voters) to express their views at annual meetings (elections).

If they don't do this, and if they accept constantly greater dividends (gifts) than the corporation's income can stand, they are headed for trouble. In the case of government, that means assessments (increased taxes) for every stockholder (citizen)—or economy to bring the operating costs of the corporation within its income.

The stockholders in the U.S. government corporation have a choice—they can instruct their hired officers and directors to cut expenses to income, or they can pay higher taxes.

The result of rising public debt, waste and demands from voters for handouts is inflation. The stockholder voters are getting a taste of inflation. But, they have seen nothing yet, unless they curb their own demands and those of their elected officers and directors. They still have free elections and the right to vote and express their wishes.

Grand Canyon Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, those of us in Conugress concerned about the increasing destruction of our natural resources stand firmly against the proposed Grand Canyon legislation which would authorize the building of dams to flood portions of this great scenic wonder.

I sympathize with the plight of those living in the Southwest for an adequate water supply. The purpose of these dams, however, is not to increase availability of water, but, rather, to raise revenue from the sale of electricity in order to pay the costs of importing water from the Columbia River. Electricity could be generated at least as cheaply by steam-plants without destroying the natural beauty of the Grand Canyon.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include an editorial on this important subject in the June 25, 1966, Chattanooga Times in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GRAND CANYON DANGER

We hope the Tennessee delegation in Congress and all others interested in conservation will oppose the Administration-backed bill to build dams above and below the Grand Canyon. Vigorous opposition will be necessary, even though the case against the measure is obviously strong.

The reason advanced for the building of these dams is not flood control, the provision of water for the Southwest or anything else but the generation of revenue through electricity sales.

What the incomparable Grand Canyon gets is a flooding in part, destruction of some of its beauty and a general encroachment on its natural state.

Rep. BILL BROCK says: "Conservationists are unanimous in their opposition. They suggest that electricity could be generated at least as cheaply by steam plants. . . . I believe they are right, but the fight will be difficult to win."

Proof enough of this lies in the fact that one day after the Sierra Club ran newspaper advertisements about the danger to the Grand Canyon, the club received notice from the Internal Revenue Service that contributions to it would not necessarily be tax deductible any longer.

Propaganda organizations have no right to deduct their activities. But we say that the Sierra Club is in an entirely different role in this instance. The law says that an organization that devotes a "substantial" portion of its income or efforts to politics is lobbying. But the IRS has no standard definition of "substantial."

In the meantime, the club is unlikely to get many contributors until its status is decided. And the move smacks of harassment and reprisal.

It should strengthen the resolve of those who want the Grand Canyon preserved as it is against bureaucratic assaults. The canyon is perhaps the foremost scenic wonder we have. It makes no sense to constrict it with dams in order to make money; most especially as long as any contention exists that steam plants could do the same job.

Wayne State University Policy on Student Draft Deferment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letter and statement by Dr. William R. Keast, president of Wayne State University:

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY,
Detroit, Mich., June 20, 1966.

The Honorable CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. DIGGS: Knowing that you are concerned about the operation of the Selective Service System and about the future of higher education in Michigan, I take the liberty of enclosing a statement on the Wayne State University policy with respect to certain aspects of student draft deferment. I would be happy to have your comments. I hope very much that the Congress will undertake as soon as possible a thoroughgoing review of national service policy. I would be happy to lend any assistance I can to such a review.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM R. KEAST,
President.

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY POLICY ON SELECTIVE SERVICE

(By William R. Keast)

The changing guidelines for student deferment under the Selective Service System, and the widespread concern over the operation of the system in general, especially as it involves the university, make it urgent that we review the policies under which Wayne State University's relations with Selective Service System are conducted. This statement is confined to the role of the University, under current legislation and national policies, in providing information to be used by Selective Service Boards in deciding upon the deferment of students. It does not attempt to deal with national service policy as a whole.

I hope that this statement will not only clarify Wayne State University policy but that it will contribute to general discussion of an urgent national problem.

Before turning to questions of immediate University policy, however, I wish to record my strong personal conviction that a comprehensive review of our entire national service policy is long overdue and urgently needed. The deferment of college students, whatever the method of its administration, should be prominent in such a review. The present system of student deferment is, in my judgment, deeply inequitable. Access to higher education is very unevenly distributed in our society. Identification of students as a separate group eligible for deferment, without regard to other factors, has had the effect of reinforcing major defects in our educational system and of compounding inequities in our social and economic structure.

If university students are to be deferred, however, and if universities are expected to provide information on which local boards can base their deferment decisions, universities have a heavy responsibility to insure that such information is as accurate and reliable as possible. They have an equally heavy responsibility to insure that in its dealings with the selective service system, the university does not distort or damage its educational program or compromise its fundamental responsibilities. This review of University policy is prompted by the fear that information now being requested by Selective Service is not and cannot be reliable enough for the serious purposes for which it is to be used, and that the procedures required to provide the requested information may indeed prejudice the educational program and objectives of the University.

Until the Spring of the current year, Selective Service guidelines for student deferment required local boards to determine whether a registrant was enrolled in a regular academic program, and whether he was making satisfactory progress toward completion of that program in the time normally required. Wayne State University has supplied to local boards, when requested to do so by its students, official statements on these questions. It has also supplied, at the student's request, transcripts of his course record and grades to supplement the statements concerning enrollment and progress. Wayne State University will continue to provide these categories of information to Selective Service Boards when requested to do so by its students. Such information is also customarily provided, for example, to prospective employers and to other schools to which students may wish to transfer. A student would seem to have a right to this information and to its distribution. The only requirement is that the student himself initiate the request that it be supplied to any agency outside the University.

The revised Selective Service guidelines on student deferment issued this Spring introduce a new element. Selective Service Boards are now directed to consider not only the student's status and his progress toward a degree, but in addition his class standing or, alternatively, his performance on the new Selective Service Test. These new factors are intended to provide local boards with a basis for selecting, from within the group of students making satisfactory progress toward degrees, those to be called first as draft quotas increase. Students are eligible for deferment, in general, if they rank in the upper half of the full-time male students in their class at the end of the freshman year, in the upper two-thirds at the end of the sophomore year, and in the upper three-quarters at the end of the junior year. Graduate students are eligible for deferment if they ranked in the upper quarter of their undergraduate senior class. Students falling below these ranking points are eligible for deferment if they score 70 or above on the Selective Service Test as undergraduates and 80 or above as graduates.

Class rankings may be determined in any way an institution sees fit, provided the ranking includes only full-time male students. Rankings may be determined by colleges within the University or on a university-wide basis. They may be based on cumulative grade averages or on a term-by-term analysis of grades.

Currently, Wayne State University practice is to determine and record the class rank, by college, for men and women together, only for students completing an undergraduate degree program, on the basis of the student's total record. Class rankings are not recorded for freshmen, sophomores, and juniors. The questions of University policy, therefore, are whether to make such rankings before the end of the degree course, whether to rank male students alone, and whether to make these rankings available, upon request by students, to local selective service boards.

After careful review of this question, in which I have had the benefit of the advice of the University Council Policy Committee and the recommendation of the University Council, I have come to the conclusion that it is unsound educational policy to establish class rankings of Wayne State University students prior to the completion of their undergraduate programs of study and to make rankings available for use outside the University. (I have serious reservations about our present policy of making senior class standing a part of the student's final transcript, but I am not prepared to modify this policy without further study.)

The educational arguments against class rankings are numerous and in my judgment compelling. Many of them have been put forward in the public discussions of selective service during recent months. I have space here to list only a few of the more important of them.

1. Grading practices and standards vary widely among members of the same faculty, among units of the same university, and between institutions. Inferences as to comparative aptitude, application, and progress based on such variable measures are highly unreliable. Institutions also vary greatly in their selectivity, in the quality and intellectual homogeneity of their student bodies, and in the rigor and difficulty of their programs. Comparisons among students of relatively equal ability or promise enrolled in different institutions will almost certainly be untrustworthy, even if we could assume that grading standards were comparable.

2. It may perhaps be possible to make tolerably accurate discriminations between the very best and very poorest students in a class on the one hand, and the great bulk of students on the other. But fine distinctions based on grade-point averages among students in the large middle range—and this is the zone where such disinctions must be made for Selective Service purposes—are impossible to make with confidence. The attempt to do so leads to absurdity. It regularly requires computing grade averages to the second or even the third decimal place. A grade of 3, or B, may be intelligible if we know enough about the institution, the course, the teacher, and the other students. But what does an average of 2.926 mean? When such averages are rank ordered, further absurdities appear. The last student in the upper half of the class is found to have an average of 2.435, and the top student in the lower half of the class has an average of 2.429! A selective service board, informed, that the first student stood in the upper half and the second student stood in the lower half of his class, might well believe it was making a rational decision if it continued to defer the first and drafted the second. But a university would surely be remiss to mislead serious citizens in this way. Its culpability would be the greater if it were to follow the advice of a national professional organization on how to break ties between students who have identical averages: "date of birth and alphabetic sequence." we are informed, are "reasonable" ways of breaking ties.

3. The emphasis on grades and class standing produced by these selective service procedures will surely intensify several undesirable features of our present system of higher education. Many educators are troubled by the emphasis on conventional academic achievement in the form of high grades already pronounced in our colleges and universities, and indeed in our secondary schools as well. Competition for admission to colleges, competition for graduate places and for scholarships and fellowships, and competition for employment opportunities often distorts the normal patterns of intellectual growth, curbs the impulse to experiment and explore, which should be encouraged in college students, and suggests to students that immediate and obvious evidence of achievement, whether or not accompanied by other evidences of personal development, is educationally and socially desirable. These pressures are also likely to inhibit needed experimentation in colleges and universities. University faculties across the country are trying to find ways of breaking the academic lock-step. Experiments are being carried out, for example, to substitute "pass" and "fail" for traditional grades for the entire freshman year, or for a certain portion of the student's entire program, as a means of encouraging students to broaden their academic interests. Such experiments—which we should consider at Wayne—would be difficult or impossible under a system of regular class ranking of the sort contemplated by the new selective service guidelines.

4. Class rankings are likely to operate to the disadvantage of the student who can pursue his education only if he is employed, because his performance will be limited by the time he must devote to his job. Approximately 75% of the Wayne State University students are employed. To compare their class standings directly with those of students of comparable ability who are not obliged to work for a living will place our students at a disadvantage.

5. The awareness on the part of both student and teacher that grades are to be converted into class standings for a purpose not directly educational may well introduce into their relationship an element prejudicial to fruitful educational experience. Some instructors will be too lenient. Some students will substitute compliance for serious inquiry with the risk of being wrong. In any event all will be aware of a new and disturbing presence.

These are some of the reasons that have led me to conclude that the determination and publication of detailed class rankings is educationally undesirable. The University Council has recommended that the University should not provide class rankings on its students. I have attached the Council's recommendation on this and related topics. I am directing the University's administrative officers to inform selective service boards that class standings will not be provided for students before the completion of their undergraduate studies. We will of course review this policy continuously. We will conduct discussions with student representatives to assess its impact.

This policy cannot be put into effect immediately. Wayne State University students may have decided not to register for the June Selective Service Test (the last scheduled until Fall 1966) on the presumption that their class standings would be reported and would be high enough to make them eligible for deferment without reliance on the test. We must not place these students at a disadvantage. Therefore, class standings will be determined on an individual college basis, using cumulative averages, for all male students as of the end of the Spring Quarter 1966. Individual standings will be reported to local boards upon the registrant student's request. Thereafter, or until selective service guidelines and procedures are modified, class standings will not be available. Registrants will therefore need to consider taking the Selective Service Test as an alternative.

I am aware that the policy announced here is at variance with the current practice of most institutions in Michigan and elsewhere, and that it runs counter to the recommendations of certain national educational associations. I hope to see a widespread reappraisal of current institutional policies. Accordingly I am forwarding copies of this statement to my colleagues on the Michigan Council of State College Presidents and in the Michigan Association of Colleges and Universities with a request for early meetings to discuss the issues. I am also sending copies to the Presidents of the American Council on Education, the Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, the American Association of Colleges, and the Association of Urban Universities requesting them to join me in a call for immediate review of Selective Service procedures affecting education.

The educational issues discussed in this statement include but a few of the pressing problems identified in recent months as reasons for a comprehensive reconsideration of our entire national service policy. Therefore I am sending copies of this statement to Michigan members of the Congress, to members of cognizant House and Senate committees, and to officers of the Federal Administration strongly urging such a review.

Who Manipulates the "Student Protest"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I found the following article a most interesting analysis of the "organized student protest." "Who Manipulates 'Student Protest'?" could well bear reading by all my colleagues who are trying to cope with this problem of our youth in revolt in their own cities and towns.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 20, 1966]

WHO MANIPULATES 'STUDENT PROTEST'?

(By John Chamberlain)

When this country dies, the medical examiner's verdict many very well be that it has perished of its own innocence.

Curiously enough, one of the main culprits in sustaining this innocence is our vaunted scientific method. Here we have at hand a rather exhaustive statistical poll purporting to determine "the scope of organized student protest in 1964–1965." It comes to us from the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, and the man who has put the pollsters' material into analytical words is Richard E. Peterson.

The Educational Testing Service survey sought to get behind the "stereotypes" epitomized by the Berkeley revolt, and it succeeds in making a case for the view that "proportions of students involved in pacifist demonstrations were, comparatively speaking, quite small." As for the "proportions of student bodies actively objecting to U.S. Vietnam policies," these by no means matched the number of protesters against such politically innocuous matters as dress regulations.

Off-campus questions of civil rights moved more protesters than any other issues. But the issue of food—"organized unhappiness about institutional cooking"—ranked second as an issue for campus protest, well ahead of such questions as Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, "ban-the-bomb," and the censorship of student publications or clampdowns on campus appearances of "a particular person of leftist persuasion."

All of this data is worth having, for it tends to "cool" much of the excitability engendered by reports of the student "revolt." But the survey is woefully deficient when it comes to probing for the origins of the "new student left." It utterly ignores the question of the forces that have been working behind the scenes to harness "leftist" protesters to the end of serving Soviet and Red Chinese foreign policies at the expense of basic U.S. interests.

The survey speaks vaguely of "the activities of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Students for a Democratic Society . . . and other organizations (that) are clearly working on a number of fronts to expose and eliminate perceived sources or injustice and contradiction . . . in American society."

But you will search in vain through Peterson's pages for anything bearing on the role of the "Old Left," whether Soviet Communist or Maoist or Trotskyite, in penetrating and twisting the operations of supposedly indigeonous student organizations.

The FBI has documented the role of 75 young comrades who were trained by Communist leaders Gus Hall and Herbert Aptheker at Camp Midvale in Ringwood, N.J., to go forth and make the DuBois groups the "youth section" of the Soviet Union in the United States.

If "student radicalism" is worth probing, it should be probed in terms of its organizing dynamics as well as in terms of its answers to abstract questions about "justice." But the computer is evidently blind to questions of origin and control. This is the "new science," a eunuch thing.

Tribute to Harvey O. Payne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, at the recent annual convention of the Texas State Bar in San Antonio, Mr. Harvey O. Payne, director of public relations for the State bar, was honored for his outstanding contributions to the organization during the past 10 years.

Over the past 25 years, I have had the good fortune of knowing and working with Mr. Payne. We were both area directors under the old National Youth Administration in the early days of that fine program.

Years later, I had the privilege of working with his lovely daughter, Janis, when she was a member of my staff in Washington. Harvey Payne, his genial and vivacious wife, Mary, and Janis, are great citizens and leaders in their community.

Mr. Payne's keen observations and timely recommendations have been of immeasurable assistance in the successful efforts of the Texas State Bar.

Mr. Payne, who possesses a warm and endearing personality, has also on numerous occasions provided invaluable assistance in cultural, civic, patriotic and charitable endeavors.

The plaque honoring Mr. Payne was presented by Mr. Byron Fullerton, assistant dean of the University of Texas Law School, and I believe that Mr. Fullerton's remarks provide a fitting footnote to the distinguished career of Mr. Payne, and so therefore I commend his words for your attention:

Presentation of Plaque to Harvey O. Payne

It is hard to conceive of anyone from Hutto, Texas becoming a success at anything—but we have finally located one man who deserves the title of "The Pride of Hutto" because of his success in his chosen profession.

Harvey O. Payne, Director of Public Relations for the State Bar, has served the bar since 1956 with loyalty and distinction.

The Public Relations Committee, its present and past members, take this means, Harvey, of saying "Thank You" for the ten years of distinguished and effective work you have done in behalf of the State Bar.

We need not recite your work but we do point with pride to the great benefits realized by the Bar from what is considered by many to be the finest public relations program conducted by any state bar association, a program planned and executed largely through your efforts.

On behalf of the Public Relations Committee I present this plaque to you. It reads as follows:

"Presented to Harvey O. Payne with deep affection and appreciation of his services as Director of Public Relations of the State Bar of Texas. 1956–1966. From present and former members of the Public Relations Committee of the State Bar. General Assembly, State Bar of Texas, San Antonio, Texas, June 30, 1966."

You can now say that you are truly the greatest of all Hutto Hippos.

And we do not want to overlook the farsightedness of such men as Homa Hill whose dedication to the bar spawned the public relations program and retained the services of Harvey Payne. To these men we also express our apperication.

The Promise of American Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the full promise of American life for each and every citizen is a goal toward which we are all striving. The Congress has taken and is continuing to take giant steps in this direction. In the midst of unprecedented prosperity for most, striking examples of special hardships remain.

A call to abolish the barriers to fulfillment of the promise of American life for all was eloquently issued at the commencement of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro in Greensboro, N.C., June 5, by the Honorable Frank E. Smith, a former Member of the House who is continuing to serve his country as a director of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Through our service together on the House Public Works Committee, I have personal knowledge of Mr. Smith's service and dedication to improvement for all sections of the Nation. His remarks at Greensboro reflect that dedication to the full promise of American life for all people. I am including his address at this point in the Record:

The Promise of American Life

More than fifty years ago a young scholar named Herbert Croly published a book called "The Promise of American Life." It still ranks as one of the most influential books in American history. Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom and Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal both reflected the ideas it encompassed. In that book Croly first voiced the concept that massive government intervention should bolster the economic system in times of stress, a remedy commonly accepted today by all political faiths.

Today the American economic system, working in collaboration with government, has achieved a state of prosperity and stability virtually undreamed of a few years ago. Those of your generation fortunate enough to receive above-average education enter a world where economic security is almost a fact of life.

There are, of course, significant exceptions to this prosperity and security. There are regions of the country in which industrial expansion, automation, and change have been too swift to accommodate all the unprepared human beings involved. The most striking examples of these archaic economies, with their resulting hardships, are the coal regions of Appalachia and the cotton country of the deep South, but there are others, equally acute if not equally publicized—the remote forest areas of the Far West, for example.

Aside from the regions where there is special hardship today, there is another kind of exception with an even more crushing type of hardship—that of the disadvantaged and the uneducated, whatever their race, or their age, or their locale. You will recall that in heralding our new world of unparalleled economic security, I carefully limited the guarantee to those members of the new generation who had the benefit of an above-average education. For the young Negro who fits this definition, today's opportunities have never been equalled. By contrast, however, the uneducated Negro actually faces the probability of falling even farther behind his educated brother than he already is.

If, without forgetting our obligation to improve these exceptions, we accept the success of the American economy, what then is to be the promise of American life for your generation?

One of the privileges of youth is your tendency to ignore the long stretch of time. So, though you have very likely not realized it, your generation will dominate our society for the remainder of the 20th century. I suppose you have to reach my age bracket before you begin to realize that the actuaries count you better than half done, and to balance the years and what you've done with them against the span and spirit of man.

I don't think anyone would take issue with me if I said the 20th century has been the most cataclysmic in history, for both good and ill. We necessarily believe that the good outweighs the ill. But the 20th century is two-thirds gone. In terms of the promise of American life, what, for the next 34 years, will it be? Or perhaps the more important question is, what should it be? I am an optimist, and I believe that the answer to the second need not be far removed from the answer to the first.

On that premise, what must the promise be? First of all, it must bring to full reality the promise of equal citizenship given in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. In the great social and political revolution of the past few years, the last important legal barriers to this reality have fallen. The Federal Government is fully committed to the task of eliminating second-class citizenship. In the days ahead here in the South, we should not be content until our state and local governments reach the same commitment.

There is every reason to believe that this goal can be achieved. One of the great hopes for the future of American life is that there will be lifted forever from the white Southerner the burden of conscience of race which he and his forebears have had to carry for three hundred years. There is every reason to believe that the affluence of our economic system will continue through your lives and beyond. Enlightened business leadership, as well as enlightened governmental policy, will both contribute, for both have now accepted their responsibility to maintain full employment and the fullest possible prosperity.

As I mentioned earlier, however, there are still blight and hardship in the midst of this unprecedented national prosperity. There is no reason why they should be allowed to remain. The War on Poverty, with all of its imperfections, is evidence of the national will to reject economic deprivation for any citizen. The commitment to the future must be continuing efforts to increase the efficiency of our economic system so that it can utilize the productive labor of every citizen. The pressures for a larger labor force today, both skilled and unskilled, provide ample proof that our American system can be so improved that it will offer economic security for every citizen.

The scourge of poverty and hunger will be eliminated in its entirety only by an economic system that operates always at the top level of efficiency.

Active government intervention has been necessary in the past, and it will undoubtedly be necessary in the future. The greatest need, however, for our economic system is a better educated citizenry. Better prepared workers and managers can provide greater productivity for the system, and thus enable continual improvement in wage and salary levels. Better education is therefore probably the best contribution that government at all levels can make to the American future.

Flowing from the potential productivity of our economic system, there is good reason to believe that every citizen should be able to earn a return above the level we have come to define as poverty. For that matter, there is no reason why our standards for measuring poverty should not become broader every year. Tomorrow's minimum standard should be, and can be, what is regarded as a medium standard today.

It is easy to belittle the potential of economic utopia and talk about the dole and the alleged adage that the poor must always be with us. Of course, there will always be individuals whose personal handicaps, physical or psychological, are so great that they cannot meet a useful responsibility in society, but there is no real evidence at all to support the theory that Americans will not respond to valid opportunity with productive work. The contrary is being proved every day, as labor supply becomes more difficult and valuable new additions to the labor market are regularly drawn from groups heretofore considered useful for only the crudest of unskilled work.

Even though we recognize that we are not likely to achieve a complete economic utopia, I think we can all safely accept the fact that for most of our society, the struggle for bare existence is behind us. Just a generation ago this was a fiercely real struggle for most Americans, and it is not surprising that there has been much comment about the seeming obsession with personal economic security on the part of my own generation during the two decades since World War II.

All but the exceptionally underprivileged of our society are now reasonably assured of economic security. Does that leave a meaningful goal for the generations who will grow into maturity and dominance during this last third of the century? I believe it does, but, even more, I believe the realization of that goal can offer more to mankind than civilization has ever had the opportunity to achieve. In a word, that goal should be quality—the quality of life.

The quality of life will be much improved by the elimination of racial injustice and discrimination. It will be further improved by the elimination of economic injustice, which denies a reasonable opportunity to earn the level of livelihood that makes possible present-day standards of comfort and security. The quality of American life will be improved, too, by the new recreational opportunities and facilities essential for vigorous people with healthy bodies to enjoy.

But the most important addition to the quality of life must be an intensely personal one, the greater individual capacity to absorb, appreciate, enjoy, and extend the lasting values of the intellect and the spirit which are the supreme contributions of our heritage of Judeo-Christian civilization. We need to build and preserve a physical environment which permits an appreciation of esthetic qualities that our ancestors were denied by the sometimes grubby and mean affairs of the daily struggle for existence. Exposure to artistic creation, nature's and man's, can help develop an appreciation for qualities of life too often unknown to much of our population.

It will be your task to build a society that gives free and full reign to the development of man's intellect. Thus the economic growth essential to America's future must include varied education, from the basics needed to comprehend and communicate to the scientific and inventive genius upon which we have come to depend. But much beyond these fundamentals, education must be a stimulation of the intellect to help us achieve more of the finite and infinite capacity of the human mind.

For too long we have depended upon luck and circumstance for the men who have left the marks of achievement on their fellow man and on succeeding ages. Far from disparaging these achievements, let us create for the future a citizenry keenly perceptive enough, and appreciative enough, of the intellect to assure us that there will be no unrecognized or undeveloped genius. An educational system that offers opportunities limited only by each man's capacities and initiative is the only way to achieve this.

We have been talking about the American future and the American institutions which must create it, but we all realize that a parochialism which would limit our progress or our failures to national boundaries would doom us. Full economic achievement is vastly dependent upon economic expansion in the rest of the world. The American economic system influences the whole world and is in turn influenced by factors throughout the world. The attainment of a stable and peaceful world is basic to fulfillment of the promise of American life.

We are far more mature about the world in general than ever before. Hopefully, our maturity will let us approach the problems of world relationships in such a way that we will not collapse into obliteration of the civilizations we have achieved.

The steadily developing maturity which has marked our relationship with the Communist powers is an example of the progress that has been made and that must be continued on a vastly greater scale. No political doctrine is more abhorrent to the American people than that of totalitarian Communism. We have checked its spread in the world at considerable sacrifice in both blood and money. Striving to hold this aggressive ideology in relative checkmate, we have come to realize that we have to coexist with it or face the witless alternative of a war of annihilation. We have seen healthy evidence that the same pressures for a better life which motivate us also influence the people of Russia, with a resulting, if reluctant, acceptance of a balance of power while the needs of individual citizens are met. There is reason to believe that some of the same inevitable pressures are beginning to work in China. Nothing has changed enough to warrant relaxing our guard against the aggression of the Communist powers, but there is certainly a faint outline of the way out of the dilemma of armed camps at permanent standoff. Unremitting search for an end to the cold war must be continued, for without its eventual solution, the promise cannot become reality. That solution must rest on a common realization that the ideals of human life hold no place for human slaughter.

This, then, is what the promise of American life should be. Its fulfillment is essential, and it doesn't really matter whether we want it selfishly in order to achieve our own hopes for our own country, or in order to attain the universal hope of peace and brotherhood for the world, because intelligent American leadership is also essential to permanent world peace and stability.

We will not succeed, however, without the kind of activist, discontented, provocative minds that have always made the greatest contribution to our country's achievements. Those minds do not grow out of placidity. In spite of the relative physical comfort and security we have now, and to which we will grow even more acclimated in the future, we will succeed only through hard work and sometimes frustrating struggles. It is these struggles which offer the true challenge and the ultimate excitment for you and your generation.

The popular notion that we can live without stress and conflict is one of the philosophic errors of our time. A world so cushioned and sheltered against experience would not be worth the trouble to the healthy, intelligent human. Another passing fad is the notion that drugs or other artificial stimulants are needed to induce excitement and revelation. The world around you, for anyone who bothers to examine it, is full enough of excitement, in the fight for a better life, and of the revelation of the heights to which man's spirit can soar in the process.

So far, everything I have urged upon you could as well have been said at any university, or before any audience. But what I am about to say has a real significance for each of you. It refers to another current notion—and one I would ask you to consider with care. We are told from every sort of forum that we have wasted the talents of women, and so we have. I would deny the whole theme of my statements today if I suggested that you should not pursue careers and seek in that way to add to our intellectual community and our progress. But I do suggest that it also lies with you to develop successors worthy of the climate you must strive to create, and that you should not shortchange the importance of the children who will one day shoulder your tasks to such an extent that you fragment your energies and your talents and in the end achieve nothing so much as the destruction of your own serenity. A great deal of what we call civilization is, in fact, tradition, and to a large extent tradition is the province of home. It survives, to sustain, by being passed on, and children do in fact become what their parents inspire them to become. I hope you will remember, with confidence and a great deal of satisfaction, that contributions to the intellectual and spiritual progress of man are not all made by manning a microscope or a computer.

In whatever realm you elect to work, and upon whatever path you choose to follow, my invitation will be open to you. I invite you to join in the quest for quality in American life.

The 158th Birthday Commemoration of President Jefferson Davis

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, on the occasion of the 158th birthday commemoration for Jefferson Davis, there was held, in Statuary Hall of the Capitol, a ceremony under the auspices of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, District of Columbia division.

For this ceremony, they selected Mr. John N. Wheelock, executive director of the Federal Trade Commission, as their speaker, and he made a very fine address.

I wish to include herein with my remarks, the text of his address and commend it to the reading of the Members of the House.

The address follows:

Speech by John N. Wheelock, Executive Director, U.S. Federal Trade Commission, June 4, 1966, on the Occasion of the 158th Birthday Commemoration for President Jefferson Davis, in Statuary Hall, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C., Presented by the United Daughters of the Confederacy, Mrs. Wayne R. Delaney, President, District of Columbia Division

Mr. Payne, Madam President, Madam President General, Daughters of the Confederacy and Friends.

I want to express my appreciation for the singular honor you have bestowed by allowing me to assist you in perpetuating the memory of Mr. Jefferson Finis Davis on this, his one hundred fifty-eighth birthday. Down through the ages men have distinguished themselves for as many reasons as there are grains of sand on the desert.

In Jefferson Davis, we find a man steeped in a selfless devotion to an ideal, a principle, a way of life that men had struggled to achieve since the beginning of recorded history. The dream seemed to have become a reality 25 years before the birth of him, whom we honor today, in the ratification of the Constitution of the United States.

Jefferson Finis Davis could not have been other than he was—being the tenth child and last issue as well as the fifth son of Samuel Emory Davis, a Revolutionary War soldier, and ardent admirer of Thomas Jefferson and Jane Cook Davis, who numbered among her relations, one General Nathaniel Green of Rhode Island, the same Nathaniel Green who put the British to rout in South Carolina. Jefferson Davis' middle name leads us to suspect that among his parents' many virtues lurked a fine sense of humor, since he was to be the last child through nature's intervention, they gave him the middle name of Finis.

The name Jefferson was given to honor the author of the Declaration of Independence.

At birth, because of an ailing mother, his care passed into the hands of his sister Ann, then 16 years of age.

We conjecture that from Ann he learned to appreciate beauty and gentleness. From a stalwart, physically active father and the older brothers, who worked the fields along side their slaves, came the lessons of manhood. An oft quoted family axiom was "Cowardice is the most contemptible of bad qualities." The lad's formal education began at the age of 5 in the usual backwoods log cabin school. At age 7, his Baptist reared father, being dissatisfied with the scholastic quality of the school, decided to send the boy to St. Thomas, a Catholic school located in Kentucky. Jefferson accompanied a friend of his Brother Joseph's on this 700 mile journey by horseback and coming to Nashville, Tennessee, he was introduced to Andrew Jackson and spent several days as "Old Hickory's" guest. In later years, he was to remark of his brief sojourn with Mr. Jackson, that prior to our meeting, I had heard that the General could cuss a blue streak, therefere while in the General's company I listened very attentively, but to my disappointment not one curse word did he utter. Needless to say, the brief visit made a lasting impression on the boy. Taking leave of the Jacksons, Jefferson Davis continued on the journey and arrived at St. Thomas School in good time to begin the term. Since the child was the only Protestant and the smallest boy in the school, an elderly priest took him under his protection, had the boy's bed placed in his own room, and looked after him as a father would a son. At St. Thomas, Jefferson witnessed the fruits of service and self-abnegation. The good friars of the school were careful to isolate him from their religious teachings and he gained a thorough respect for discipline and authority.

There came a time when young Davis felt that he wanted to embrace Catholicism and he voiced his desire to Father Angier at the dinner table one evening. Remarking on this incident years later, Mr. Davis said, "When the good Father heard what I had to say, he looked at me for a moment with a sweet and gently indulgent smile, and replied, "That for the time being you had better partake of some nourishing Catholic food and offered me some biscuits and cheese."

Toward the end of his second year at St. Thomas, Jefferson was called home at the insistence of his mother. It was decided that the return trip would be made by steamboat, a mode of transportation starting to appear on the great rivers of America. So, at the age of 9, he became one of the first Americans to use this method of travel. On the slow voyage down the Ohio, thence into the Mississippi, the impressionable, astute observer with an open mind, rested little. It has been written that questions were ever on his lips, his inquiries delved into every facade of what he beheld and heard. Old Captain deHart, the Commander of the steamboat Aetna, on which young Jefferson Davis was a passenger was thoroughly examined by the boy, throughout the voyage. The good Captain jokingly remarked to brother Joseph that he felt himself fortunate indeed that the boy was not a member of the Marine Examining Board at the time of his application for a Masters License. As the steamer plied its way down the river, making stops to pick up and discharge cargoes at various and sundry settlements, Jefferson Davis noted the appearance and listened to the conversations of the men at the docks. He was singularly impressed by the cleanliness and independence of the Indians who came to the boat to trade fresh killed meat for staples. He noted that the Indians were a cleaner lot than many of the white men he had seen along the river. The vastness and dynamism of his country began to impress itself on his comprehension. It was as if he sensed the pulse beat of America.

He was enthralled by the panoramic beauty of its geography and said so many times. At long last the Aetna docked at Natchez, population 2,000, where his brother Joseph had a law practice.

Brother Isaac had come from Woodville to meet him and when Isaac and Joseph met the young man at the gangplank they were delightfully surprised at how he had grown. The self assurance of his mannerisms and way of speech were noted and Joseph sensed that here was no provincial lad, but a young man who was better traveled at age ten than most adults and that the seeds of a first rate liberal education had been planted in fertile soil. The welcome he received on his arrival home was more than warm, it was the first and last time he ever witnessed his mother's tears and his father who had always suppressed deep emotional feelings, threw his arms around the boy and kissed him again and again. After a brief rest, Jefferson Davis, was entered in Jefferson College and during his attendance at the school, he spent the weekends with Joseph in Natchez. Joseph, at this period, was in the middle of drafting the Constitution of Mississippi, which incidentally, was admitted to the Union on December 10, 1817, which happened to be Joseph's 33rd birthday. After a year at Jefferson College, Jefferson Davis was transferred to the Academy of Wilkinson County, a school closer to his home. It was while attending this school that young Davis felt that the work load was beyond his abilities and he complained to his father about it. After a moments reflection, his father informed him that all the members of the family must work with their heads or their hands and if Jefferson felt that the school work was too difficult for him, he would employ him in the fields. After two days in the blistering hot cotton fields, Jefferson returned to school and complained no more.

At 13, Jefferson Davis was considered ready for University training and he was enrolled in Transylvania University at Lexington, Kentucky. The president of the school was an ordained Unitarian minister from whom Jefferson learned religious tolerance. At Transylvania, he developed an avid taste for reading and seldom took part in sports. It was at this time he made a lifelong friend of Albert Sidney Johnson who became his "ideal of manliness." It was here that he came under the eye and won the "favorable regard" of Henry Clay, whose son was one of Jefferson Davis' close friends.

His Commission to West Point, dated March 11, 1824, arrived just as young Davis was preparing to enter the senior class at the University. Jeff was not overwhelmed with joy, even though appointments to the academy were much coveted in that year. He had been looking forward to studying law at the University of Virginia but financial difficulties at home precluded his desire. Three days before he accepted the academy appointment, news came of his father's death. This coupled with the death of his youngest sister and childhood playmate, Mary, just two months before seemed to crush him completely. An excerpt from a note to his sister-in-law gives us an insight into his sensitive nature and the trace of melancholy that lurked there. He wrote, "This is the second time I have been doomed to receive the heartrending intelligence of the death of a friend. God only knows whether or not it will be the last. If all the dear friends of my childhood are to be torn from me, I care not how soon I follow."

The grief stricken boy of sixteen took leave of his many friends at Transylvania in July of 1824 and started his journey to West Point Military Academy. Arriving too late for the new term, he was required to take a special entrance examination. The examination was so unorthodox and sketchy, that Jefferson Davis later wrote, "Since that time, I have never believed than an examination formed a very conclusive rule of decision upon qualifications of a person subjected to its test." In any case, the examination passed, Jefferson entered into the rigorous routine of the Academy.

He renewed the old friendship with Albert Sidney Johnson and was accepted into Johnson's "set" where he made the acquaintance of Leonidos Polk, later to become Episcopal Bishop of Louisiana and a fighting

General in the Confederate Army. During the period 1825–26, there were five men at the Academy destined to become leading figures in the Confederacy. Jefferson Davis' record at the Point was not exceptional, being a high spirited, fun loving individual, with an independent temperament, he had little difficulty in accruing 120 demerits in his plebe year, 70 demerits in his second year, and a rousing 137 demerits in the third year. Two hundred demerits in any one year would have meant automatic dismissal. At graduation on July 12, 1828, he stood 23rd in a class of 33. It has been written by fellow cadets that Jefferson Davis was distinguished in the Corps for his manly bearing, his high-toned and lofty character. His robust and soldierly figure and his springy step was likened to the tread of an Indian on the warpath. He stood approximately six feet in height. The discipline instilled at West Point was probably the most useful thing Jefferson Davis took along when he left the Academy. He certainly did not absorb the way of pliancy and assumed cordiality of the politician—in fact, the reverse was true. He had no use for phonies or sychophants and became openly hostile on encountering anyone who suffered from these defects. It has been written that this lack of political virtue was a prime source of Davis' failure to please a lesser breed of men during his term as President of the Confederacy.

After his graduation, Lt. Davis visited his home on three months' furlough and went from there to Jefferson Barracks situated near St. Louis. After a brief taste of pleasant duty, Jefferson Davis was transferred to the northern frontier where he served with exceptional credit for almost four years. It was during this tour of duty that he came in contact with Colonel Zachary Taylor and fell in love with the good Colonel's daughter, Sarah Knox Taylor. Every member of the family grew fond of the young Lt., but Colonel Taylor frowned on any thought of marriage where an army man was concerned, because of his awareness of the rough life that women were forced to lead on the frontier. To add weight in the father's case against the marriage was Jefferson Davis' vote against him on a matter of principal in a minor court martial.

During the year in which he met and fell in love with Sarah, the first challenge to his patriotic philosophy was encountered in the form of South Carolina's threat to nullify the unjust protective tariff decreed to favor New England industries. Davis became convinced that his regiment would be among those sent to force the State into submission. Of this incident he was later to write "by education, by association, and by preference, I was a soldier, then regarding my profession as my vocation in life. Yet, looking the issue squarely in the face, I chose the alternative of abandoning my profession rather than be employed in the subjugation or coercion of a State of the Union." "The compromise of 1833 prevented the threatened calamity, and the sorrowful issue was deferred until a day more drear, which forced upon me the determination of the question of State Sovereignty or Federal Supremacy, of independence or submission to usurpation."

The same year, in 1833, Jefferson Davis was promoted to 1st Lt., and ordered to Kentucky to recruit troopers for his uhit, thence to Arkansas where he began to realize that army life on the frontier was no place for a woman and that his fortunes had not advanced appreciably after almost seven years service. Furloughed home, Jefferson Davis discussed his problem with Joseph who finally persuaded him to leave the Army and become a planter. Jefferson Davis tendered his resignation from the Army, to take effect on June 30, 1835, and married his sweetheart over the objections of her father.

Immediately after the wedding, the bride and groom booked passage on a steamboat bound for Mississippi and brother Joseph's plantation, where they were to live until Jefferson Davis had cleared his land and built a house. Three months after the wedding Sarah Knox Taylor Davis was dead of malaria—a blow from which Jefferson Davis never recovered. It was decided that a change of scenery would help him get over his grief and so accompanied by his body servant James Pemlerton, he sailed for Cuba, thence to New York, Washington, D.C., and home to Hurricane, the Plantation, on Davis' Bend.

Jefferson Davis shut himself away from the world for seven long years, and occupied himself with devouring the books contained in his brother's vast library. Discussions between the brothers were endless and without argument for they were as one in their thought on history, politics, and philosophy.

In 1843, he was persuaded out of his seclusion to run on the Democratic Ticket in opposition to the Whig Party, at that time a power in Mississippi.

Although he lost the election, the Democratic Party saw in him, a dedicated Paladin for the cause of State's Rights. It was shortly after this that Jefferson Davis met and lost his heart to Varina Anne Howell, the daughter of one of his brother Joseph's closest friends. After an extended courtship and engagement, they finally married on February 26, 1845. Returning to Brierfield from their honeymoon in New Orleans, Jefferson Davis almost immediately found himself caught up in the swirl of politics and was nominated to run for Congress on the Democratic ticket. It was while he was traveling to Natchez to speak that he decided to spend a day with his mother and found her laid out for burial. She had died the day before. Shocked to the core of his sensitive nature, he rode all night to inform his wife of the tragic news. After a brief rest and with a fresh mount he rode back to keep the promised engagement because he knew that people had come for miles to hear him speak. The election won, Jefferson Finis Davis was sworn in as a member of the 29th Congress of the United States on December 8, 1845.

From this day forward Jefferson Davis became a man of destiny. He served with great distinction in the Army during the War with Mexico. Subsequently, he was U.S. Senator, and was Secretary of War in the Cabinet of President Franklin Pierce. Finally, he was selected by his beloved Southland as President of the Confederate States of America. No man fought and worked more nobly for his country than did Jefferson Davis. He was a great Mississippian—he was a great American. With the passage of time, Jefferson Davis of the South and Abraham Lincoln of the North became a part of the heritage of all America—both North and South.

Fujiwara: Success Over Handicap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of the notable characteristics that successful men have in common is their resolute determination to achieve success. An example of this truism may be seen in the career of Honolulu contractor, Mr. Harold Fujiwara. Mr. Fujiwara's success—he is president of Island-Wide, Inc., a well-known construction firm in Hawaii—is all the more admirable because he attained this pinnacle in spite of a physical handicap.

Long hours, personalized services, careful paring of overhead, and a policy of passing on to his customers the savings he gained as a diligent businessman have given him an enviable reputation among Island construction circles.

The inspiring story of Mr. Fujiwara's persistent endeavors to become a success was the subject of a recent newspaper article by reporter Charles Turner. I now submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the story which appeared in the June 29 issue of the Honolulu Advertiser:

FUJIWARA A SUCCESS, DESPITE HANDICAP

(By Charles Turner)

Fifteen years ago, Harold Fujiwara was a beaten man.

He had suffered a crippling accident while working as a carpenter, losing four fingers on one hand.

No one wanted a one-handed workman in those days, when jobs were scarce and Oahu was yet to experience its post-statehood building boom.

But Fujiwara made a comeback, first by struggling along as a commercial fisherman and later by taking correspondence courses which enabled him to go into the construction business on his own.

Today, he heads Island-Wide, Inc., a company which did $3 million worth of business in its first two years.

How was he able to make such a success?

"Because I made up my mind to be somebody," Fujiwara said.

In the days when he was struggling to support his wife and two children on a meager income from commercial fishing, Fujiwara drove himself 12 to 16 hours a day.

It broke his health, and his doctor warned him to get out of fishing.

"He told me, 'You must get on land and on a diet,' " Fujiwara recalled.

With the knowledge gained from his correspondence courses, he managed to get a foreman's job with the Capehart Housing project at Schofield Barracks. He later became a superintendent on similar projects at Barber's Point and Manana Housing.

In 1959 he opened his own business, Rural Home Builders, with a work force of five or six men.

"With the experience I had and the knowledge I gained in construction I felt that I could make a success," he said.

Rural Home Builders became well known in its field, principally because Fujiwara made it a point to be always available to his customers. He worked out their financing problems and helped design their homes.

As his reputation grew, so did his confidence.

In 1964 he founded Island-Wide "to help sub-contractors create more jobs and help out the local industry." Business was slow at first, but gradually the jobs came in. By the end of the year, he had done $1 million worth of home-building.

One of the secrets of his success, Fujiwara said, was his ability to cut overhead to the bone and pass the savings on to his customers.

What does Fujawara think about the future of the home-building industry in Hawaii?

"It's going to level off, but will pick up gradually," he said. "It has to level off, because costs keep going up. But the tight money situation should hold prices down.

"It's also going to slow down construction, at least until the money situation eases."

Meantime Fujiwara isn't going to sit back and wait for things to get better.

He plans to keep his office at 3249 Koapaka St. open until 9 p.m. daily.

Since his day begins at 6:30 a.m., it will mean a return to the old routine of working 12 hours or more a day.

But Fujiwara thinks it's worth the effort. And the 30-odd subcontractors who depend on him to provide them with home-building jobs agree.

Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, quite naturally, the press of the Nation has hailed enactment of the freedom-of-information bill.

The information media are especially interested because they are links with the general public. But ordinary citizens will also be the beneficiaries.

As President Johnson said when he signed the measure, no longer can curtains of secrecy be pulled around decisions which may be revealed without injury to the public interest.

The people's right to know is vital in a free society as several newspapers have remarked in editorials calling attention to the new law.

These editorials are illustrative of many which have been printed on the subject, and under previous permission I insert them in the RECORD. They are taken from the Washington Post, Christian Science Monitor, Indianapolis Star, and Wyoming Eagle.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 6, 1966]

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

President Johnson's signature on the freedom of information bill puts a useful statute on the books. He deserves a great deal of credit for signing it in the face of the adverse position toward it taken by a great many government spokesmen. Citizens will be grateful, not only for the bill, but for the attitude toward information which the President disclosed when he directed officials to observe the spirit of the law before its effective date a year from now.

The novelty of the new legislation lies in provisions under which the citizen denied information can appeal to the courts. This proposal grew out of the studies started in 1950 by the American Society of Newspaper Editors and emerged from the findings of the late Harold Cross, author of *The People's Right to Know*. Dr. Cross was appalled at the discovery that government officials were asserting a right to withhold information and that citizens had no appeal from the mere assertion of an official that he would not disclose.

The machinery for compelling disclosure probably is of more practical use to ordinary citizens than to the press, because of the inability of ordinary judicial process to move swiftly enough to satisfy press requirements. But the detail of the statute's practical remedy is less important than the assertion of principle. Citizens hitherto enjoyed a certain power to compel disclosure by sheer publicity. If they could not compel officials to divulge they sometimes could make them wish they had. Now, in addition, they are morally armed with an explicit assertion that citizens have a right to know, except in certain well defined exceptional situations. And they are legally armed with the right to take officials into court for improper withholding.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 7, 1966]

PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW

With the passage and signing of the "freedom of information" bill, secrecy for the wrong reasons on the part of the federal government's excutive agencies should at last be substantially curbed. In the words of President Johnson, government officials should no longer "be able to pull curtains of secrecy around decisions which can be revealed without injury to the public interest."

Past law has been wholly inadequate to force disclosure of information which infringes neither the national interest nor individual privacy. When this legislation goes into effect, any person can challenge the government in court to produce specific records or prove their withholding justified.

The burden of proof, in other words, will rest with the government. Should the court decide that a government official is wrongly withholding information from the public, he can be held in contempt of court.

The President is satisfied that the bill, while providing for public access, contains adequate safeguards to protect national security, vital foreign policy information, trade secrets, personal data, and the like. Such vague reasons for nondisclosure as "good cause found" will be replaced by certain clearly defined exemptions.

In the case of categories exempt from the bill, it is contended that, on balance, the public interest and the cause of individual liberty are better served by secrecy than by disclosure. The measure, moreover, does not curtail, or affect in any way the traditional executive privilege whereby the President may direct government agencies to withhold disclosure of certain information from Congress when he believes this to be in the national interest.

This legislation, with its recourse to the courts, should prove a boon to lawyers, journalists, historians, and ordinary citizens who on occasion in the past have been unjustifiably rebuffed in their efforts to break through official wraps of government secrecy.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, July 6, 1966]

THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT

A great many commentators have been predicting that President Johnson would either refuse to sign or reluctantly sign the Freedom of Information bill just passed by Congress.

They were wrong. The President not only signed it, he issued a strong and enthusiastic statement praising the aims and requirements of the law. "I signed this measure," he said, "with a deep sense of pride that the United States is an open society in which the people's right to know is cherished and guarded. Democracy works best when the people have all the information that the security of the nation permits.

"No one should be able to pull the curtain of secrecy around decisions which can be revealed without injury to the public interests."

No one should. The President deserves the thanks of all free Americans, as does this Congress, for seeing to it that this law is now on the statute books. For the first time the right of the people to know what their government is doing, how their government is doing it, and why their government is doing it is specifically protected by Federal law.

Objections have been raised that such a law might force disclosure of national security secrets, but the law provides adequate safeguards against that. The final decision on what should or should not be disclosed will rest with the courts—should a dispute arise. Now the burden of proof is put upon the government to show that information is withheld justifiably, and not to hide error, fraud, misuse or deception.

This is not a law just to give power to the press to get information from the government. It is a law guaranteeing that the people will now have access to information about their government, from many sources, so that they can better judge whether they are being served well or badly.

While the importance of this law to the future freedom of our people cannot be overstated, the President went even further in supporting the principle of freedom of speech in this country. "A citizen must be able, in confidence, to complain to his government and to provide information just as he is—or should be—free to confide in the press without fear of reprisal or of being required to reveal or discuss his sources."

Some state laws allow prosecution for refusing to reveal sources of information in which news stories are based. In a recent case a young editor was hailed before a court because she refused to reveal her source of information about a drug addiction story. So it is clear that while this new law is a great step forward, there is more to be done on a local level.

The President's unequivocal support of the Freedom of Information law should give impetus to new efforts in the states to end these remaining restrictions on the rights of the people to speak up without fear or persecution.

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Eagle, July 6, 1966]

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

"I have always believed that freedom of information is so vital that only the national security, not the desire of public officials or private citizens, should determine when it must be restricted."

With those words, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law, on July 4, 1966, the "Freedom of Information" bill.

With exceptions, the measure is aimed at giving any person the legal right to look at government records and to put the burden of proof on federal officials if they invoke secrecy on security or other grounds.

The President said he did not share the concern of some that the bill might "impair government operations."

"I am instructing every official in this administration to cooperate to this end and to make information available to the full extent consistent with individual privacy and with the national interest," he said.

Signing of the "Freedom of Information" bill came just a week after the U.S. House of Representatives unanimously gave it final congressional approval.

At that time, Rep. JOHN E. MOSS, D-Calif., who had fought for open-files legislation for 10 years, said the measure would make available information which federal offices often withhold "only because it was embarrassing or inconvenient to supply."

There is no doubt many government officials—at all levels of government—are and perhaps always have been inclined toward secrecy.

As any newspaper reporter can tell you, many public officials—at local, state or national level—are inclined to hold back on information which might be embarrassing or uncomplimentary. Those same officials, on the other hand, frequently are more than cooperative in getting out the information that makes them look good.

The public is entitled to all the news—the good and the bad—so long as it doesn't affect the national security. That's one of the things that makes democracy work.

It seems particularly appropriate the President should have signed the "Freedom of Information" bill on the 190th anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence.

Thomas Jefferson, who headed the committee and was assigned the job of drafting that great document, was one of history's great champions of freedom of the press—the right of the people to be informed.

Jefferson once said, "The basis of our government being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter . . ."

Sermon by the Reverend Sydney Waddington, Rector, St. John's Episcopal Church, Lancaster, Ohio, July 3, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, from the pulpits of many churches across this Nation the modern-day relevance of God and country was reiterated on Sunday, July 3, the day before this country celebrated the 190th anniversary of its independence.

The Reverend Sydney Waddington, rector of St. John's Episcopal Church in Lancaster, Ohio, my home city, took the same occasion to deliver a most thoughtful and informed sermon in support of current U.S. policy in Vietnam. Since the Reverend Mr. Waddington spent most of his ministry in the Far East and is an active student of foreign affairs, he is well qualified to speak on the subject.

I am happy to commend to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the recent sermon of this distinguished Ohio clergyman:

It is not my purpose this morning to deliver a theological sermon. I remember on board ship one day a woman was telling me about her lack of religion, but she said one thing that impressed me. She said she liked to go to hear a certain preacher because he discussed foreign affairs so well. Having been engaged in some discussions previously with the lady, I wondered how she knew, and I also felt that this was not the best method of preaching the word of God!

Yet this morning I should like to do just what at that time it seemed to me I would not care to do, and that is to discuss foreign affairs from the pulpit.

I do so because the United States is today faced with many problems in its forign affairs and apparently there is a great deal of confusion about what is attempted and what is being done. Having spent the major portion of my ministry in the Far East and having continued my interest and reading in this field, it may be that what I have to say should carry at least equal weight to that of the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, who until a short time ago apparently did not know that Australia and New Zealand had separate governments!

In my discussion of what is happening in the East today may I preface my remarks with a short review of history. For the life of these United States until after the First World War we enjoyed the peace enforced by British sea power. When trade, commerce and the freedom of man to go anywhere he wished was hampered, British sea power soon set matters right. True, Perry opened Japan to Western trade but it was only because nine-tenths of the high seas were controlled by the British that the United States was able to send such a sizeable fleet to Japan.

As British power faded we hoped that the League of Nations (of which the United States was not a member) would fill the power vacuum, but Mussolini in Abyssinia, Japan in Manchuria, showed the League, with all its good points, could not keep the peace.

Finally Germany proved that an unscrupulous major power could defeat, conquer and occupy a weaker country and only a coalition of powers could whip it back into line. World War Two further proved that any coalition without the industrial might of the United States was pretty weak.

Like it or not, before World War One England was the great peace keeping force in the world and after World War Two the industrial might required to keep the peace resided in the United States.

Power brings responsibility. If you use your power properly this is the responsible exercise of power. If you fail to use the power granted you this is just as much an abuse of power as is its improper use. When power is yours you must from a moral point of view make good use of it, for it is immoral to allow it to go to waste.

Harland Cleveland, U.S. Ambassador to NATO says, "We are concerned about every breach of the peace because the peace of the world is too likely to prove indivisible, and because if trouble spreads, local Communists backed by major Communist powers have an opportunity to take sides as a prelude to taking over. We are involved because we are widely believed to have the power to fight or prevent fighting, to sit on the lid or let the pot boil over, to change or maintain the existing balance of political power in every part of the globe. And this impression is not far from the truth, for we are probably the only nation which now has the wealth, firepower, airlift capacity, organization skill, and (we hope) political imagination to put together an operational world system for peaceful change."

Times have changed since the beginning of the century. No one power can by itself hope to control the world. Anything on the international scale must be done in cooperation with other nations. This we Americans, so long protected by the British Fleet and so long accustomed to going our own way, do not seem to understand. The American Government, a trifle sensitive to the appellation "big bully", tries not to go it alone. Whenever action is necessary it will take action, but will do everything possible to act in consort with other nations. This refusal to play "big brother" or "big bully", depending upon what view you take, has us united with other nations in NATO, SEATO, OAS, and about 440 other multilateral pacts besides the United Nations. While we jumped into Korea we were quick to appeal to the U.N. We acted in the Dominican Republic but immediately appealed to the OAS. We are now deeply involved in Viet Nam but SEATO has been called in and Australia, Korea, and the Philippines all have sent help, and we are using bases in Thailand. We are not "going it" alone. We are attempting in cooperation with other interested and concerned nations to see to it that South Viet Nam has the opportunity of setting up its own government. Much has been said about lack of elections, of government by a few instead of a truly democratic government. It always distresses me that no such charges are made against the government of North Viet Nam where no election has ever been held nor are any elections scheduled, talked about or even contemplated!

It is not clear to me that a Democratic government is possible, desirable, or necessary, but an enlightened government with the interests of the people rather than the promotion of an ideology is all that can be hoped for.

Time last week had a most excellent essay "On Understanding Asia" that it would pay you to read before you make up your mind about the necessity of insisting on a democratic form of government for Asiatic states.

When France was forced to withdraw from Viet Nam the power formerly exercised by her vanished, and the only real holders of power were the Communists in the north who then wanted to fill the power vacuum in the south. It is thus the present task of our allies and ourselves to supply to the South the power that is lacking. The right use of power is what is asked of us, for as I pointed out earlier, to fail to use the power we have is just as much a misuse of power as is its abuse.

So, to me at least, we are morally bound to use power in a cause we consider right!

As any executive knows, as his power increases his decisions become more complicated. And as one problem is solved two more require his attention. We are inclined to want simple black and white alternatives but the problems are complex. The Marshall Plan, a great success story, solved the reconstruction of Europe, but now we have the even more complex problem of how to get along with Charles DeGaulle. We must not over-simplify. We can no longer think in terms of peace or a world war. The alternate to a world war may not be peace but rather a series of small disputes and small wars.

Our President has been sharply criticized in the last few days for bombing so close to Hanoi. A bomb dropout from an aeroplane is a devastating thing, but not more devastating than a bomb placed outside a hotel on a street by a secret agent. Surely the techniques of warfare are terrible. But the clandestine assassination of school teachers and village leaders is more terrible. The Viet Cong in 1965 alone murdered or kidnapped over 12,000 civilians. This is a tragic drain on the intellectual, political and economic life of the country.

The terrors of war are real. The devastation and demoralization of the country and population are facts that I have had to live with without benefit of army rations, PX privileges or massive organizational support. These horrors are perhaps more real to me than to most. But the final justification for our continuing to carry on the struggle against Communism is the continuing choice made by the people of North Viet Nam. Wherever and whenever the opportunity has been given or can be seized these people have voted in the only way possible where Communism holds sway. They have voted with their feet, and by the thousands, men and women have turned their backs on the Worker's Paradise and made their way as best they could to the sanctuary of non-communist territory.

To refuse to sustain those who look to us for the power they lack will not postpone but, rather, hasten the day of our own downfall.

At any point in history from Hitler's occupation of the Ruhr to the falsely labeled "Peace In Our Time" of Munich, Hitler could have been stopped as the records available today clearly show. But after his power grab at Munich nothing but all-out war could stop him. When the communistic world understands that it will be stopped wherever it tries to extend its system, no matter what disguise of ruse it tries to use, then, and not until then, will it seek to expend its energies for the welfare of mankind rather than the subversion and enslavement of others.

Peace at any price is too high a price to pay for slavery. May God who gave us this good land for our heritage, who has placed upon us the responsibility of power, grant that we may use it in His service and to the benefit of our fellow men!

Meeting Tomorrow's Challenges Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, not too long ago, Mr. Hugh Downs of the "Today" show, spoke at the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs on the occasion of the banquet honoring the outstanding squadron of the year at that unique institution.

The thoughts he so aptly expressed seemed so apropo to so many people outside of his immediate audience that I asked Mr. Downs for some excerpts from his speech to insert in the Congressional Record, and I offer them now:

Remarks by Hugh Downs at the Air Force Academy Dinner, June 4, 1966

This is my first experience at an Air Force Academy event and—I must say—I am very impressed.

Not only that—this is my first trip to Colorado Springs. How anyone who likes to say he's been around could be so late in arriving at the home of the Air Force Academy, I'll never know.

* * * * *

This is a most invigorating spot. Not only the air, which is great, but the whole atmosphere of the place. It is invigorating to get caught up in the spirit and dynamics of the Aerospace Age which the Air Force Academy epitomizes. There is a feeling of drive, of a rushing the seasons to a more exciting and challenging tomorrow.

* * * * *

Dr. Harold Brown, the brilliant physicist who serves as Secretary of the Air Force, recently indicated that the modern Air Force is fast becoming an egg-head organization—that the number of blue suiters with Master's Degrees and Ph. D.'s is rapidly increasing . . . that the interface between higher education and the Air Force is getting closer and closer. I thought of this also when I was in England and did a broadcast feature on Oxford University and one of my guests was a Rhodes scholar—from the Air Force Academy.

You are eggheads . . . military eggheads. Be proud of it.

The late Adlai Stevenson once told a graduating class—"Eggheads of the world—unite. You have nothing to lose but your yolk."

* * * * *

It was, I believe, good advice.

Now there must be a way to establish a relationship between eggheadedness and girl-chasing or life isn't worth living.

I don't mean girl-chasing—literally. I use the phrase to represent loosely the more gutsy qualities of the balanced human male.

History identifies the so-called "Renaissance Man" of a few hundred years ago—as an individual who brought combined mental and physical efficiency to a high pitch.

He was a great student and thinker, perhaps a poet of stature, and at the same time he was skilled in swordmanship and a leader of men. But most important his strength never stood in the way of his capacity to care—for a woman—and for the human race.

The modern age calls for—is crying for—the Renaissance Man of the Twentieth Century, who merges the scientific and the humanistic, who can handle both technological and social problems with intellectual toughness and emotional stability . . . sort of a hard-boiled egghead with a soft yolk of social consciousness, you might say.

Now, if such a guy is going to emerge, in any numbers, my guess is that he has to be motivated where big issues are forced and he has to absorb his education in the brisk environment of efficiency that is currently associated more with the military than anywhere else. And I would add that the Air Force Academy, with its merging of the humanities, scientific knowledge, physical fitness and military leadership, shows evidence that it is pacing the educational world in the development of the modern Renaissance Man. In fact, this Outstanding Squadron of 1966, which we salute tonight, selected for its all-around strength rather than its specialties, is representative of this educational movement.

* * * * *

Continued good leadership for our nation requires that we encourage and develop new thought as conditions change—that we maximize use of our manpower resources—that we insure a supply of men who know how to use strength without losing compassion, and how to voice dissent without damage to loyalty. And that we keep up our technological capabilities.

Science and technology have yet to make the world safe for democracy. But at least they can reduce the chance of worldwide conflict—as long as the forces of freedom retain technogolical superiority.

* * * * *

That's one side of the technological story. The other, of course, is that progress and technology are practically synonymous in the era we live in. This inter-dependency is well-known. And the historic pattern of technology being created largely in response to defense requirements, remains pretty solid. The interrelation of technology and progress can be seen as a chain: Progress is essential to science. Science makes possible defense capabilities—a position of sound defense safeguards an atmosphere of freedom. Freedom can tolerate and afford new thought. And new thought creates progress.

So ultimately it will become the responsibility of you cadets, along with other uniformed and civilian members of the government, to guard and guide our national technological resources. There is perhaps no more demanding and challenging task today. You have the education, the incentive and the teamwork to master the job. And, thank God for that.

First Anniversary of Convening of Congress of Micronesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. N. NEIMAN CRALEY, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1966

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the people of Micronesia on the first anniversary of the convening of their first territorywide Congress.

A year ago Congressman Rogers C. B. Morton and I observed and participated in the formal opening of that Congress for the people of the Marianas, Caroline, and Marshall Islands, islands which the United States has administered as a trust territory for the United Nations as a result of World War II.

On July 12, 1965, I had the honor and privilege to address the first Micronesian Congress in the territorial headquarters at Saipan. I was there to represent Congressman Wayne N. Aspinall, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member.

Spread over 3 million square miles of the Western Pacific Ocean, the 2,141 islands with a population of some 90,000 people, are known to Americans for the battles fought there in World War II and as the testing grounds for the Atomic Energy Commission after the war.

As the islands' administrator the United States has worked for the political, economic and social progress of the people, fostering schools, teachers, immunication and hospital programs. The first Micronesian Congress is a symbol of the progress that has been made—a significant step in the development of self-government for these people. A vital tradition of American democracy has been entrusted to the Micronesians who occupy a strategic position in the Pacific area. They are anxious to prove themselves capable of such political maturity and I wish them well in this endeavor.

Cleaner Water, Purer Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times gives hearty support to legislation approved by the Senate Public Works Committee to provide cleaner water and purer air.

One bill, of course, would help finance a program to enable cities and towns to treat municipal wastes that are now handled inadequately or not at all.

With State and local cooperation, the bill's proponents believe a $20 billion backlog of needed waste treatment facilities can be wiped out in the next 6 years.

A second bill would effectively expand the scope of the present Air Pollution Control Act.

By enacting these measures, which have administration backing, the Times suggests great progress can be made toward cleaning up our water and air. Its editorial on the subject follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 3, 1966]

Cleaner Water, Purer Air

If a bill reported by the Senate Public Works Committee is enacted into law, the nation will take a giant stride toward cleaner water.

Under leadership of Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE of Maine the committee has approved a program to spend $6 billion between now and 1972 to help towns and cities treat municipal wastes that are now treated inadequately or not at all. Since this Federal contribution would represent roughly one-third of the total cost of each project, proponents of the bill believe that with local and state cooperation the entire backlog of $20 billion in needed municipal waste treatment facilities can be wiped out in these next six years.

In the past, the Federal Government has contributed 30 per cent of the cost of each project, but up to a limit of only $1,200,000. This low ceiling harshly penalized cities that required large projects. The pending bill eliminates any dollar ceiling. It would have been ideal if the committee had adopted the proposal of Senator GAYLORD NELSON of Wisconsin, who urged that the Federal Government meet 90 per cent of the cost, as it does on the interstate highway program. But the committee judged, probably correctly, that such a ratio was not politically feasible at this time.

If all states were now to follow the excellent pattern developed in New York under which the state matches the Federal contribution and the locality puts up the remaining 40 per cent, then the pending bill would meet its goal. But not all states are willing to invest in clean water. To encourage state participation the bill provides a bonus of 10 per cent of the Federal grant wherever a state joins in, as New York has done. Where states do not provide matching funds, municipalities can still apply directly to the Federal Government and can also qualify for a Federal loan to substitute for the state share.

The committee bill follows only in part the "demonstration rivers" proposal set forth earlier this year by President Johnson. But if the interested states can agree on a plan to clean up an entire river basin, the bill would enable the Federal Government to defray half its cost.

In a companion measure the same committee approved a considerable expansion in the scope and financing of the existing Air Pollution Control Act. Over the next three years, $196 million in Federal aid would be made available to the states to help in control of air pollution.

Much more has to be done, particularly at the local and state level, to combat water and air pollution. Too many communities still refuse to recognize that dirty water and smoggy air are major menaces to the health and safety of the nation. An effective program requires construction of more facilities to treat raw sewage and air pollutants, strict enforcement of quality standards for air and water, and intensive research and more rapid application of what is already known.

If the two bills reported by the Senate committee are approved by Congress, important progress can be made in meeting all three of these requirements.

Dam the Grand Canyon: IRS—Yes or No?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, damming the Grand Canyon may be a major step backward for conservation.

If Bridge Canyon—or Hualapai—and Marble Canyon dams are to be built, two-thirds of the Colorado River's length through the canyon would be flooded by reservoir waters. This may very well be a tragic impairment of the canyon—not, as the Bureau of Reclamation would have us believe, a desirable improvement.

One of the conservation organizations which brought this threat to the public's attention is being investigated by the Internal Revenue Service at this critical time when the Nation is just beginning to appreciate the gravity of the dam proposals.

The unfair procedure by which the IRS, in effect, is seeking to deprive the Sierra Club of tax-deductible status was the subject of a thoughtful editorial in the Long Island Press of June 18, 1966. I submit this fine editorial for the consideration of my colleagues.

GRAVE ERROR BY THE IRS

Every non-profit, public service group in the country has cause for concern over the Internal Revenue Service's treatment of the Sierra Club. Citizens who count on such public service organizations, and who support them by their contributions, also have reason for considerable concern.

The Sierra Club, headquartered in San Francisco, is one of the oldest and best-known campaigners for conservation. It has 20 chapters throughout the country.

Like millions of other Americans, it doesn't like the idea of two more dams being built in the Grand Canyon. Many Long Islanders have raised their voices.

Last week the club ran two advertisements in newspapers opposing legislation in Congress to permit the dams. Almost quicker than you can say Grand Canyon, the IRS suspended the Sierra Club's tax-exempt privileges, pending further investigation.

The IRS position—or excuse—is that the revenue code says a group can't have tax-exempt status if a "substantial" part of its income and efforts are devoted to politics or lobbying. The code doesn't say what "substantial" is, however.

A galling aspect of the IRS action is that even before opening an investigation, IRS said it would no longer necessarily view donations to the club as tax-exempt. That is an authoritarian and unfair position. At least it should have waited until after a full investigation and hearing.

David Brower, the Sierra Club's executive secretary, made a neat comparison when he said the IRS action was "like Con Edison pulling the switch as a warning to you that they are going to shut off your power. It is clear that no sizable contributions will come to the club as long as this cloud hangs over."

The IRS action is an arrow into the heart of vigorous public-service voluntary organizations who draw heavy financial support from givers taking their tax deductions. It would apply to any kind of organization—educational, cultural, even religious—which raises its voice on any side of any issue. Tax exemption loss—or threat of its loss—must never, even accidentally, be used to throttle public service groups from speaking through any and all channels.

The Sierra Club should be commended for its public service in bringing this matter to the forefront of public attention. I do not consider an action designed to benefit the great number of Americans who seek to preserve our natural resources, as "lobbying." If indeed it is—then "lobbying" for the commonweal—where private or corporate interests and profit are not involved—should not be objectionable.

Committed to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, in his recent speech at Omaha, President Johnson asserted:

> This nation, working with others, must demonstrate in Vietnam that our commitment to freedom and peace is not a fragile thing.

The Deseret News of Salt Lake City cites that statement of determination in an editorial commemorating Independence Day. The newspaper reminds those who sometimes may forget the fact that men are endowed by their Creator with the spirit of freedom in their souls.

This is one of the several editorials which I have seen honor the spirit of patriotism and focus on the basic truths of the society envisioned by the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Seldom in our history has it been so necesary to emphasize that the pursuit of liberty is a continuing struggle. For it is right now that we fight in Vietnam in defense of the principles to which Thomas Jefferson gave such eloquent expression.

I would like these editorials to appear in the RECORD. They are from the Deseret News, Newark Sunday News, Philadelphia Inquirer, Chicago Sun-Times, Dallas Morning News, Denver Post, Houston Post, and the Los Angeles Times, as follows:

[From the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah, July 2, 1966]

OUR COMMITMENT IS NOT FRAGILE

"We hold these truths to be self-evident," wrote Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence 190 years ago, "that all men are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights . . ."

These, he, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin and the other signers defined as "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

The Declaration was bold. Yet, in less than two centuries, nation after nation has adopted this very theory of government: that men are, or should be, equally entitled to liberty.

America has battled side-by-side with other nations to defend this principle—16 years ago in Korea, and now in South Viet Nam.

President Johnson, speaking in Omaha this past week about peace and war, said: "Someday we will all work as friends and brothers—to grow more food, to build more schools, to heal the sick, to care for the old, to encourage the young.

"But history is not made by nameless forces. It is made by men and women, by their governments and their nations. This nation—working with others—must demonstrate in Viet Nam that our commitment to freedom and peace is not a fragile thing. It can, and it will sustain a major test."

Freedom no longer lies in independence alone. It lies also in interdependence. Today, in an age of dictatorship—of the right or the left—the idea that governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed" remains a daring concept, and is more important than ever.

On this July 4, ponder the imposing message of the Declaration of Independence. It rang true in 1776. It rings true today. Men are endowed by their creator with the spirit of freedom in their souls. Throughout history men have fought and died for this concept. Brave men always will.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News, July 3, 1966]

So Proudly We Hail

This age recalls the Independence Days of tradition with mingled nostalgia and cynicism. And, indeed, it would be amusing to hear now some of the chauvinistic oratory that marked the Fourth of July in bygone years, featuring George III and his Hessians as villains and proclaiming the superiority of all things American.

The danger is that in our more sophisticated self-appraisal we may lose appreciation for the enduring significance of the day we celebrate. We were the first people since the fall of the Roman Empire to rebel against colonialism, and our example is still an inspiration. It is 190 years since the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, but its phrases still echo in Asia and Africa.

In defense of the principles to which Thomas Jefferson gave such eloquent expression, we have twice fought against aggression in Europe where, at enormous expense, we still stand guard. It is in their defense that we fight today in Viet Nam. That our interventions have not been without self-interest does not make them less worthy.

Like all nations, we have been fallible and foolish. But never has any people supported its ideals with more fidelity and generosity, or suffered, in return, more misunderstanding and contumely.

With all our faults, at home and abroad, we have used our power to serve others. In contrast with some contemporary great powers, we have caused no nation to lose independence. On the contrary, we have helped many to win it, or keep it.

Despite the breastbeating of some of our fellow citizens, and the indictments of our enemies, we have a right to hold our heads high, taking pride in the fact that Americans are willing to die that others may be free.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, July 4, 1966]

For Whom the Bell Tolled

One hundred and ninety years ago American independence was proclaimed. The Liberty Bell subsequently pealed the momentous tidings of the farthest reaches of Philadelphia and—symbolically—"throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

Then, as now, there were voices of doom and defeatism. Counselors of chronic despair said the declaration could never be implemented. It was direly predicted that the end result would be not independence but disaster.

If delegates assembled in their chamber overlooking sunbaked Chestnut street had paid heed to the critics they would have adjourned and gone home—the evils of tyranny unchallenged. But they were not to be deterred.

If General Washington, a year and a half later at Valley Forge, had yielded to the advocators of surrender he would have disbanded his army and fled. But he and his men were made of sterner stuff.

Today, in this city and in this State and in this Nation, there are families bereaved by the loss of loved ones who have made the supreme sacrifice in a far-off place called Vietnam. Some say they died in vain.

No man who dies in defense of freedom for himself or fellowmen gives his life in vain. The pursuit of liberty is a continuing struggle and all who dedicate themselves to it, irrespective of their momentary successes or reversals, make an enduring contribution to attainment of the goal.

For us, the living, on this Fourth of July in 1966, the message and the spirit of 1776 still ring true. To understand this it is necessary only to pay a visit to Independence Hall and to watch them come—by the thousands and the millions, the old and the young, from across this Nation and from abroad—to see that grand old bell, to touch it gently and to walk away taller than they came.

Why do they come?

Isn't it because the Declaration of American Independence speaks not for one people in one time but for all people of all time?

Isn't it because the Liberty Bell, on that day in the long ago, rang out the notes that are sung in the hearts of all men who aspire to be free—then, now and forevermore?

Isn't it because a yearning to cast off the yoke of oppression is universal among all who bear its burden?

The timid and the misguided in America suggest that this Nation close its eyes and ears to the plight of victims of Communist aggression. They would have us pass by on the other side.

When the freedom of any man is diminished, so is the freedom of us all. Liberty cannot survive on a lonely isle in a sea of tyranny.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun Times, July 4, 1966]

In Freedom's Cause

The Declaration of Independence, published 190 years ago today, laid down with reasoned passion an indictment of the deprivation of self-government and the denial of the natural rights of man. It stands today as a historic utterance of man's deep desire to be free.

The Declaration grew out of repression. It was given impetus by an 18th Century movement called the "Enlightenment," a movement which spread new ideas exalting the natural rights of man throughout Western civilization. American leaders found in the works of its advocates, John Locke, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot and others, vindication of their outrage against British colonial policy, which levied a succession of new laws that taxed and regulated their economy and restricted their efforts to govern themselves.

Public demonstrations against the new laws advanced the resistance. When British soldiers fired into a jeering Boston crowd, in 1770, the resistance became a cause, independent. In April, 1775, the cause became rebellion when a group of colonists standing on the Concord Bridge opened fire on advancing British troops—the "shot that was heard round the world." The fight by the 13 colonies—pigmies arrayed against one of the world's mightiest powers—has served as an inspiration to men everywhere.

Throughout history one form of restraint or another has been imposed on man to stifle his desire for freedom. Today it is the Communists who would destroy freedom and liberty. They know man's right to them and their threat to the Red ideology. Nikolai Lenin once said, "It is true liberty is precious—so precious it must be rationed."

Not so. It is the rightful heritage of all men to be free. It is a right not easily earned. Those who own it and are weak must be protected from those who would take it away from them. Liberty is so precious that it must belong to all. And as the mightiest free nation in this anxious and dangerous world it is the responsibility of the United States everywhere to help preserve and expand freedom.

In doing so, the United States help preserve its own way of life. The greatest international security any free nation could have would be a world of nations governed by the people who inhabit them, and dedicated to the principles enunciated by America's founding fathers on that historic occasion we celebrate today.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, July 4, 1966]

Patriotism

This is the day, the Glorious Fourth, when we Americans celebrate our patriotism.

The word itself, "patriotism," has been twisted and distorted in recent years. For some, it is a sneering term, the "last refuge of a scoundrel," in the sour phrase of Samuel Johnson. To them contempt for one's own native land seems the first step to cosmopolitan sophistication.

To others, patriotism seems to be their own private preserve, open only to the select few who can meet the membership standards. These standards require in most cases agreement in every particular with the speaker's beliefs and prejudices.

Still others see patriotism as a quaint term, as dated as a tricornered hat or a powdered wig. They display it on certain festive occasions, after which they put it away with the colored bunting until next year.

In fact, real patriotism is simply the love of one's country and devotion to its welfare. Almost all of us are patriots in the true sense of the word; we need no one to bestow the title upon us, nor can the cynic take it away from us. We grow into our patriotism naturally, and it becomes a part of us. It remains with us always and we express it in a variety of ways.

It is the lump in the throat when the national anthem is played, the pride when the flag passes by. But it is more, much more. It is not just a short and frenzied outburst of emotion, but as Adlai Stevenson once said, "the tranquil and steady dedication of a lifetime."

We Americans have no monopoly on patriotism; every country has citizens who prize it above all others. But, as is perhaps understandable for patriots, we feel that our patriotism is of a special kind.

We do not feel that the enjoyment of our love of country depends on the denigration, humiliation or conquest of others. We do not feel our country is diminished because our neighbor states are fiercely independent.

Our patriotism does not lead us to attempt to force our culture or our way of life on others. We have no tendency to regard ourselves as a master race, fated to rule the world.

The patriotism of Americans represents a quiet pride in their country and, above all, faith in the idea that the country represents. Ideals that were set on the first Fourth of July have proved to be good ones. If we have not achieved them in all times and places, the pursuit of these goals has taken us higher than any others have gone.

This is the day to celebrate our people's achievements, to honor those our forefathers made in the past and to dedicate ourselves and our children to the tasks of the future.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, July 4, 1966]

The Flag Is Still in Style

On the occasion of the 190th anniversary of our national independence, we note signs of a slackening of patriotic fervor, some feeling that displaying patriotism is "out," at least in these cynical times.

One reason, we suppose, is that patriotism has so often been sullied by fools and charlatans. Samuel Johnson said aptly in 1775 that "patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel."

There are those in our society today, as there always have been, who would misuse this natural and admirable feeling of national pride.

Patriotism has been used to build fortunes and glittering careers; to justify international piracy; to deny civil liberties and blacken the names of loyal citizens; to sabotage honest efforts toward world peace.

The American of 1966 is more conscious of these abuses of patriotism than his ancestors were. He is encouraged to be better informed, to be more thoughtful, even to be more critical of his country and its position in the world.

He concedes that the United States has made serious mistakes in 190 years, some of them in the name of patriotism. He knows most certainly that as a creation of human beings she will make more mistakes.

Even now great national debates go on. Americans are searching anew for national purpose and direction. Many, on this 190th anniversary of independence, are concerned and confused, feeling as a nation they may not be doing their best.

Yet they are still patriots, except in a quieter way.

Sharing their doubts and concerns to some degree, we judge nevertheless it is accurate and appropriate on the Fourth of July to say this: the United States of America, for all her faults, is altogether the most powerful, the most responsible, the most unselfish and the most compassionate nation on earth.

That's something to wave the flag about.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, July 4, 1966]

A Day for Rejoicing

"These are the times that try men's souls," Tom Paine wrote in the fall of 1776, a few months after the Declaration of Independence was signed.

The Revolution that the Declaration had set in motion was not going well. Gen. Washington's army was retreating after a series of defeats in New York. He was in great need of troops, munitions and money. The high hopes that had greeted the Declaration on July 4 were sagging. Grumbling that the war could not be won was widespread. The colonists who opposed the war—and there were a great many of them—were pleased.

But courage, determination and belief in their cause paid off for the rebels, although it must be admitted they were helped substantially by the stupidity of King George's military leaders. On Oct. 19, 1781, Lord Cornwallis surrendered his army at Yorktown. The war was won, and a new nation was on its way.

This is the 190th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Certainly, Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin and the others who debated during the hot weeks of June whether to proclaim the colonies' independence from the British crown had no idea of the great results their efforts would produce, but they did realize what independence would mean. John Adams wrote his wife that the day of adoption of the declaration "ought to be solemnized with pomp and parade, with shows, with games, sports, guns, bells, bonfires, and illuminations from one end of this continent to the other, from this time forward, forevermore."

And so it has been since that first Fourth of July. Most of the forms of celebration listed by Adams are still to be found throughout the land on this day.

But once again we know times that try men's souls. Once again we are engaged in a war for freedom, this time the freedom of a friendly nation, and we have some dissent among our people. At home, we are striving to give full meaning to the Declaration's assertion that all men are created equal, and we have some dissent among our people.

But these struggles, too, will end. We as a nation are determined that the free people of South Viet Nam will not be enslaved by Communism. We as a people are determined that the benefits of freedom and a richer life that the Founding Fathers risked so much to gain for us will be available to all Americans in all parts of our land.

Ring out the bells. Despite our problems, it is a day for rejoicing.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, July 4, 1966]

A Document That Lives

There were, of course, giants in those days. John Hancock (his name writ large so King George III could read it without glasses). The Adamses, Sam and John. Thomas Jefferson. Robert Morris. They, and 51 others from all 13 colonies signed it, knowing that the very act might condemn them to a rebel's death.

Thus, on July 4, 1776, the Declaration of Independence became a living document. It has never died. Pray God, it will inspire us for all time.

For other struggling lands, the freedom envisioned in the Declaration is still a dream. Men are dying to make that dream come true. And we, having resolved the issue, are sending our best young men abroad to aid them.

Today it is well to reconsider these words from the preamble, lest they grow dim in memory, or be lost to view in the modern sweep of events:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security."

U.S. Pharmaceutical Firms Face Difficulties in Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Record an article which appeared on March 22, 1966, in the publication Economic Survey, of Buenos Aires, Argentina. This article refers to decree No. 3042 of the Argentine Ministry of Health which seriously affects the entire pharmaceutical industry in Argentina.

In my statement of last year I stated that medical authorities in Argentina indicated that this decree, if rigidly enforced, could bankrupt the Argentine pharmaceutical industry whose 20,000 employees supply the nation with its lifesaving drugs. I also indicated a year ago that investment circles in both Argentina and the United States were watching developments in Argentina very closely because of the affect which this decree could have on the pharmaceutical industry.

Many U.S. firms operate plants in Argentina so this decree affects not only the employees in Argentina, but those in the United States which manufacture the raw materials which are sent to their Argentine plants. In view of the fact that there is now a new government in Argentina, it might take advantage of the current situation by correcting this problem which has caused so much difficulty for the Argentine pharmaceutical industry.

[From the Economic Survey, Buenos Aires, Argentina, Mar. 22, 1966]

Sales Decrease Precipitates Crisis in Laboratories

(Summary)

After 27 months of price control, during which the cost of living index has risen 77%, the already critical situation of the pharmaceutical laboratories has become extremely acute in the past few weeks due to a decrease in sales and the lack of financial liquidity.

As we reported previously, the majority of foreign laboratories and drug houses decided to surrender to the arbitrary regulations of the Law on medicaments, encouraged by the fact that with the massive increase of sales due to inflation at least partial relief was obtained to some of their problems.

Such an increase in sales resulted in more profits, even under the price control imposed by the Ministry of Public Health, and since the profits were increasing it was difficult to oppose a measure designed to control them.

But the situation has changed in the past few months particularly in the last few weeks, during which sales levels have been considerably lower than six months ago.

Furthermore, the current strike of postal employees has caused the Post Office to hold up over four million mail pieces, thus aggravating the problem of the laboratories which usually handle all shipments by mail.

If the creation of such a situation was the purpose of the Ministry of Public Health, its success is complete, although inflation and a temporary sales increase kept the true situation blurred for a while.

SLOW PROCESSING OF DOCUMENTS

In order to further assure its "success," i.e., the crisis of the entire pharmaceutical industry, the Ministry of Public Health established a very slow processing of the documents submitted by the drug companies in compliance with the provisions of Decree 3042/65.

After resisting these provisions for a number of months, most of the large foreign laboratories, and the majority of small local laboratories decided to abide by the Ministerial demands.

The only laboratories still maintaining the original position are, therefore, the larger Argentine, laboratories.

Decree 3042/65 stipulates a period of 45 days during which the Ministry must study the data submitted by the laboratories, and then authorize the prices justified by costs. An automated standard system of analysis of the submitted data was to be established, but such formula was received skeptically since it would require a previous exhaustive research (not stipulated) and a large staff of specialized personnel which the Ministry does not possess.

Such a standard system has now proved to be a failure and the Ministry at present examines the data submitted with irritating slowness, requesting clarifications, additional data, and time to study same. This result is complex paper work which calls for delays and more delays, some of them extending over six months.

The Ministry is not interested in solving the petitions for reconsideration of prices, since they would have to allow higher prices than the current ones frozen 27 months ago.

The situation has reached a truly untenable point and, unless the plan is to put an end to the entire pharmaceutical industry, it is indispensable, in view of the many unprocessed documents, to grant general adjustment of prices compatible with reality.

Fair Packaging and Labeling Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years now the American public has been subject to a barrage of "wonder" products and panaceas that offer relief from all sorts of pains, conditions, ailments, and diseases. Because of their overwhelming success, the drug and health food industries have flooded the market with a multitude of cure-alls, and have made these seemingly potent under the disguise of clever advertising that falsely promotes the value and effect of these products.

This type of campaign has been directed primarily at the senior citizens of this country—those who are in ill health most often and who can least afford to throw away their meager savings on these almost useless commodities. This is not merely the result of careless spending on their part; rather it is brought about by a public naivete capitalized on by false and alluring advertising, intended prevarications that can and should be combated by correctly informing the consumer.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 15707, a Fair Packaging and Labeling Act. This, as an extension of the Senate's bill on food and packaging, provides for clear-cut regulations on the labeling and packaging of items as to their net quantity, contents, and advertising.

It is with pleasure that I commend to the attention of our colleagues one such method of educating the public as to these false claims. The Seafarers International Union, in their publication Seafarers Log, has published an article entitled "Caveat Emptor, Let the Buyer Beware," which deals with the exact subject we are now concerned with here in the Congress. People must know the standards by which to judge these products before they can recognize and understand which are truly beneficial and which are fakery.

The article, which appeared in the May 27, 1966, edition of Seafarers Log, follows:

CAVEAT EMPTOR: LET THE BUYER BEWARE

Fakes and swindles in the field of health have become big business in the United States. It has been estimated that Americans spend $1 billion a year on falsely promoted, worthless, or dangerous health products.

Much of this fakery is aimed at the nation's elder citizens—those who can least afford to waste their money on fake treatments and products, and who can be harmed by delaying necessary professional medical treatment while in pursuit of non-existent "miracle" cures. But no one is immune from the assaults of these health quacks and frauds They make appeals to people of all age groups, all social and economic levels, and the highly educated as well as the poorly educated. Vast amounts are spent on advertising products and techniques which have at best limited value, and at their worst can be deadly to the individual who falsely places his trust in their effectiveness.

At hearings conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Frauds and Misrepresentations Affecting the Elderly, which is part of the Special Committee on Aging, witnesses estimated that, of the $1 billion spent annually on health frauds, $500 million goes for dietary frauds in the form of "health" foods, food supplements, weight-reducing gimmicks and literature, and fads and cults of this nature. Arthritis sufferers alone are bilked for another $250 million yearly on misrepresented remedies. But far worse than the staggering financial loss involved in self-diagnosis and self-treatment with ineffective products, is the danger that reliance on them can cause fatal delay in getting proper medical treatment.

Under the suggestion of Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, chairman of the Special Senate Committee on Aging, a nationwide study is to be made of factors that induce people to fall for fakes and swindles in the field of health. The study will be coordinated by the Food and Drug Administration of the Federal Government, with the cooperation of other government agencies.

The variety of frauds and misrepresented remedies which are practiced against the American public is staggering. They range from complicated, worthless and very expensive machines which supposedly diagnose or treat various ailments, to miracle charms of magnetized iron. Vitamins, health foods and books on folk medicine are classified under the category of fraud when exaggerated claims are made concerning their nutritional value to the individual. Many highly advertised patent medicines must be placed in this same category when the advertising does not make clear to the public that although the product may give temporary relief of the symptoms of an illness, it does not provide a cure for the illness—as is often implied.

The health fakes and swindles discussed on these pages represent only a partial listing, compiled from data accumulated by the Food and Drug Administration of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Senate Subcommittee on Frauds and Misrepresentation Affecting the Elderly. The following facts should be read carefully because they are of vital importance to everyone's life:

Vitamins. No one will deny that a balanced vitamin supply is essential to good nutrition and health. Yet vast amounts of money were wasted yearly on expensive vitamin supplements simply because people fail to realize that abundant supplies of vitamins are already present in the American food supply, which is the best in the world. Daily use of common foods such as vegetables, fruits, milk, eggs, meats, fish, and whole grain or enriched bread will supply all of an average individual's nutritional needs. High pressure sales techniques are used to sell millions of dollars worth of vitamins which are not needed. They are often pushed as cure-alls for every kind of disease. The fact, is however, that some vitamins are actually harmful if one takes too much for too long. Well-planned meals will supply all the vitamins needed by the average individual. In case of any doubts about individual requirements, self treatment with vitamin supplements is a serious mistake. In such cases the money would be much better spent by visiting the family doctor for a complete checkup.

Health foods. All sorts of wild claims are made for so-called "health" foods by food faddists and dietary cultists. These claims are invariably false because the "special" foods, which are sold at grossly inflated prices, contain the same nutritional value as the foods you can purchase at any grocery store or supermarket. Food fads can be dangerous to health as well as expensive when the diet is limited to one food or family of foods. Much of this food faddism has been aimed at the nation's older citizens, yet the same rule applies. No matter what his age, if an individual is in good health these special foods are of no value. If an individual is not in good health a doctor should be consulted—attempts at self treatment with special diets or products are dangerous.

In this same category are the so-called "folk medicines," often popularized in do-it-yourself health books. The potions they advocate for treating everything from arthritis to warts are often common plants and substances which have no appreciable medicinal value. All things being equal, for instance, consuming quantities of unsaturated fats will not prevent hardening of the arteries; cod liver oil and orange juice will not cure arthritis; garlic has no effect on high blood pressure; and royal bee jelly will not restore an aged individual's lost manhood. What often happens with false reliance on these quack cures, unfortunately, is that proper medical attention is postponed until successful medical treatment is either impossible or extremely difficult.

Limited-value medications. Limited-value medications are the kind that most Americans are exposed to most often through advertising. In general they offer relief for the symptoms of a disease rather than making an attack on the disease itself. This can be extremely dangerous because, relieved of the painful, embarrassing or discomforting symptoms of an ailment, people often postpone seeking professional treatment for the disease itself. Such products include pain killers, cough and cold remedies, laxatives, rupture devices, cancer treatments, sinus pain relievers, arthritis remedies, diabetic foods, antacid ulcer preparations, anemia (tired blood) preparations, and many others.

The use of these products involves the ever-present danger that relief of symptoms often masks the fact that a serious and often deadly disease is at work. A persistent cough, for example, may be the warning sign of throat cancer. Frequent colds may be the warning sign of a badly infected internal organ. General weakness (tired blood) may be caused by any number of serious bodily ailments. Stomach pains may mask cancer. The list is practically endless.

Limited-value medications have their place, but must not be considered as cures or depended upon for long periods of time. The admonition which goes along with the most reputable of these preparations to "See your doctor if pain persists" is extremely important and usually not stressed nearly enough in advertising or printed prominently enough on the package. Diagnosis of a condition must be left to a qualified doctor who, after a thorough examination, will tell you whether temporary relief or serious treatment of a disease is necessary for whatever condition is troubling you.

Arthritis remedies. Arthritis is a painful, sometimes crippling disease, which affects both young and old, although it is more frequent among the aged. Because of the severe pain and crippling effects associated with arthritis, a booming business in phony cures has sprung up. Over $250 million yearly is spent on worthless preparations and treatments for arthritis and rheumatism, ranging from pills composed of varying chemicals to expensive electric machines.

Inexpensive drugs can relieve arthritic pain to some extent, but there are as yet no drugs, devices or methods which can cure arthritis. Early treatment by a physician can reduce the pain and crippling effects. Diagnosis and treatment by a competent physician is of the utmost importance because there are many forms of arthritis which require different kinds of treatment.

Cancer treatments. There are no serums, drugs, or diets which have been proved to be effective in curing cancer although many cancer victims or their families spend large amounts of money on worthless treatments. Prompt treatment by effective methods could save millions of lives which are now needlessly lost.

Cancer can be cured with early treatment by surgery, X-ray, or radiation. Some specific types of cancer will also respond to certain drugs. Early diagnosis and treatment by a trained physician is of the utmost importance. To be cured, cancer must be nipped in the bud. The earlier it is caught and treated, the greater are the chances of recovery. Regular medical checkups are your best protection against cancer. In addition, see a doctor without delay if you observe any of the following warning signals: Any lump, especially in the breast. Irregular bleeding or discharge from body opening. Persistent indigestion. Unexplained changes in bowel movements. Unexplained weight loss. Changes in color or size of a mole. Any sore that does not heal promptly.

Cosmetic medicines. No one can seriously deny the value of good cosmetic preparations, properly applied. They can improve personal appearance and in so doing contribute greatly to improving the individual's medical health and general outlook on life, and even, because of psychological factors, make them feel better physically. Many unscrupulous persons, however, have cashed in on human vanity which makes many people willing to spend a great deal of money for products that promise what they cannot perform.

The worst of these promises are made for products containing supposed miracle chemical or scientific discoveries which will return the body, or portions of the anatomy, to a state of youth. This is impossible. The process of aging cannot be reversed. Proper care can often improve the condition of the skin, for example, if it has been neglected or exposed to wind, weather or other irritants. There is no preparation, however, which can return the skin to a state of youth. Such a false claim is often made for royal bee jelly, for example. Wrinkle removers are worthless. Similarly, there is no cure for baldness (part of the process of aging) either through medications or massage treatments. Another process of aging, the loss of the hair's color, is similarly impossible. The hair can be dyed, but its natural color cannot be restored. Special vitamins or other preparations are worthless to achieve this end.

Reducing foods and schemes. One of the most lucrative fields of fakery involves reducing products. Many fraudulent promoters have gotten rich quick by "fooling the fat" as they cynically put it, in the sale of drugs, gadgets, and diet plans and books. Barring serious glandular disturbance, overeating is the basic cause of overweight and careful and proper dieting under the supervision of a physician, is the only treatment. No matter what anyone says, no matter how many titles a convincing huckster has placed after his name, you cannot eat as much as you please and still lose weight. "Get slim quick" is nothing but the worthless slogan of huckster who wants to get rich quick.

Machines which supposedly diagnose or treat disease. One of the biggest and most dangerous health swindles is the mechanical or electrical gadget that is supposed to tell what disease a person has and how to treat it. Thousands of such machines have been manufactured and are in use by various kinds of health practitioners to diagnose and treat every kind of human ailment.

Keep in mind that there are legitimate medical devices such as those used by physicians to determine blood pressure, and to record heart action, (electrocardiograph). However one must immediately beware when phenomenal claims are made for mechanical or electrical devices. They are invariably dangerous frauds. Such devices include uranium impregnated gloves for the treatment of arthritis, machines which emit gasses supposedly beneficial for various diseases (but which are often themselves dangerous to health), devices which supposedly transmit beneficial electrical currents through the body, and other such fake gadgets.

The vibrator or massage devices are often useful to give temporary relief of muscular aches and pains, but are not effective for arthritis, rheumatism or heart conditions—nor for "spot" reducing.

How to know if it's fake or has value. The Food and Drug Administration suggests the following ways to determine whether a remedy is worthwhile:

It is a "secret" remedy? If so, you can be almost certain that it is a fake. Does the sponsor claim he is battling the medical profession or the government which is trying to suppress his wonderful discovery and keep it from the public? This is one of the surest signs of quackery. How did you hear about it? If the treatment was advertised or promoted in a sensational magazine or by a faith-healers' group, or by some crusading organization of people with little or no medical training, be skeptical. Reputable physicians or medical researchers do not operate that way.

The safe thing to do. If you feel ill, are worried about unexplainable symptoms or bodily changes, or suspect for any reason that something is wrong physically, visit a reputable doctor for a complete physical examination. Seafarers and the dependents of Seafarers should take advantage of the free diagnostic medical examinations available to them in the competently-supervised SIU clinic facilities. These facilities are staffed by experienced doctors and technicians utilizing the latest in diagnostic equipment and techniques. The SIU urges all Seafarers and their dependents to take advantage of this service regularly, even if they do not feel sick or suspect the presence of an ailment. In the early stages of most diseases the patient feels no discomfort and shows no physical symptoms of illness. In the earliest stages, when they are most easily treated and complete recovery is most likely, many diseases are discoverable only with the aid of complete diagnostic facilities utilized by competent physicians and laboratory technicians. The lives of many Seafarers and of the dependents of Seafarers have been prolonged because in the course of routine check-ups incipient ailments were discovered that they might not have otherwise learned of until it was too late for medical treatment.

Poverty and the Senators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most ill-advised, wasteful acts to come from Congress, in my opinion, was the so-called poverty program. There is no need to again elaborate on the mismanagement and political scandals of Sargent Shriver's inept "war." However, the respected columnist, James J. Kilpatrick, recently shed insight into the basic concepts of Republican opposition to this program and our desire to formulate alternatives which foster incentive and self-respect.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Kilpatrick's article, "Poverty and the Senators" in the Appendix of the RECORD:

POVERTY AND THE SENATORS

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Sargent Shriver turned up a few days ago before a Senate Labor sub-committee, with ten top assistants in tow. They made an impressive safari as they filed into the TV jungles of the hearing room, briefcased and charted, seriously bent on their big game quest. Mr. Shriver wants another $1.7 billion for the War on Poverty, and he expects to bring home his trophy.

Pennsylvania's JOE CLARK was presiding. Some other Senators—JAVITS, RANDOLPH, PELL—wandered in and out. But the most interesting figures were the junior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY; and the junior Senator from California, Mr. MURPHY; and the director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Sargent Shriver himself. Together they approached the probelm of poverty, with MURPHY going at it from one direction and KENNEDY and Shriver from another; but unlike those famous teams of tunnel drillers, they had no prospect of meeting in the middle of the mountain.

The diffident KENNEDY, firm-jawed, mop-haired, speaking so softly he barely could be heard, was there to set up some easy volleyball questions for his affable brother-in-law. The brisk and competent Shriver, an excellent sales executive, was full of a salesman's rhetoric: "What does the chart show? Let me tell you what the chart shows." And MURPHY, ordinarily one of the most articulate men around the Senate, had trouble making his points. Throughout the long morning, he never took his level blue eyes off Shriver; he looked at the leader of the War on Poverty as if he thought him not quite right for the part.

To California's MURPHY, poverty is a personal thing. He has known it, in ways that KENNEDY and Shriver never have. MURPHY grew up in a poor section of Philadephia, where 50 years ago he attended a grammar school that was 75 per cent Negro. MURPHY was 11 when his father died, 13 when his mother died. He was raised as an orphan in the Corktown neighborhood of Detroit, down behind the ball park, in a tiny house with a wood stove in the kitchen and not enough beds to go around. Later he loaded coal in a Pennsylvania coal mine. He was 23 before he finally saved enough money to finance a year at Yale.

KENNEDY and Shriver came to the hearing room, of course, with far different backgrounds. It is inevitable that they should come to the problem of poverty with quite different ideas. Shriver inclines toward the large, galactic view. He thinks in terms of billions of dollars and millions of potential recipients. His prepared statement was addressed to the several "universes of need" among the poor and illiterate. Within ten years, he thought, if enough money is spent, the universe of poverty can be dispelled.

"What we can accomplish," said Shriver, "will depend of course on what the nation feels it can devote to this effort and the President and Congress believe it should appropriate to it."

To MURPHY, gazing in perplexity on the witness, a great deal more is invloved than an act of Congress. The governments variour crash programs, unplanned, ill-thought, seem to him a fantastic waste of money—and he still sees the waste of money with boyhood eyes. Was it true, he asked Shriver, that the annual cost of training one enrollee in the Job Corps is $11,000? The actual figure, said Shriver, is $9,700; he expects it to drop to $8,000 next year. MURPHY looked at his hands as if he were still shoveling coal. "It seems high," he said plaintively, "to the ordinary family."

The adversaries got into argument on the high salaries paid within the OEO, both in Washington and in the field. Shriver brushed the charges aside as the merest nitpicking. MURPHY asked about the waste in such scandals as Haryou-act in New York. Shriver reduced him to a decimal point: Sample audits had turned up improprieties in only two-tenths of one per cent of the last billion dollars spent. MURPHY praised the work of a private businessmen's group in Los Angeles, which has provided 5,000 paying jobs for residents of the Watts area without a penny in Federal funds. Wasn't this a better approach, he asked, than bureaucratic aid? Shriver made polite murmurs. The universes of need were too vast, he seemed to be saying, for anything but universal Federal aid.

MURPHY and his Republican colleagues are not flat-out opposed to Federal aid. They see its usefulness, especially in the educational supplements that can lead to jobs and thus to self-respect. Their often inarticulate and inchoate protest goes rather to the philosophy that denies a man the uses of himself. When 569 staff members are hired to train 624 Job Corpsmen, as at Camp Breckinridge, what room remains for boys to master self-reliance? In the hands of an army of child development experts, what Headstart toddler learns to walk alone? Says MURPHY: "They don't teach that anymore."

In a way, this week's Senate hearing produced nothing more than the old charges, the old defenses, the same black marks, the same whitewash cover. Yet in the contrast of GEORGE MURPHY and the Kennedy clan, one caught a suddenly new insight into the nature of man, and the role of the state.

Captain Roberts' Letter

SPEECH
OF
HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, Capt. Archie T. Roberts is a U.S. Army chaplain on duty with the 1st Infantry Division in South Vietnam. Before going on active duty, Captain Roberts was pastor of the Dixboro Methodist Church in Ann Arbor, Mich.

Mrs. Gary Woodward, of Ann Arbor, has forwarded to me a copy of a mimeographed letter which Captain Roberts wrote to his many friends in the Ann Arbor area. The letter describes how one group of American fighting men are working to build an orphanage for Vietnamese children in Ben Cat. In order that the Members and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD might know of his work and learn where contributions can be sent, I am including Captain Roberts' letter and his APO address at this point in the RECORD:

HEADQUARTERS, OFFICE OF THE CHAPLAIN, 2D BATTALION, 28TH INFANTRY, 1ST INFANTRY DIVISION,
APO San Francisco, Calif., 96345,
April 27, 1966.

DEAR FRIENDS: Well, as was the case last time I sat down to do a mimeo letter, right after Christmas, either I do it this way or you probably won't hear from me at all. I have finally given up the idea I had earlier that soon things would settle down and I would have time to write more personal letters. There seems to be no real let up in the pace of life that one leads here, and from experience I can truly sympathize with the parents who write to the chaplain wondering why their boy doesn't write more often—just ask Gail how even she has had to wait sometimes.

In early February, soon after my battalion commander, Lt. Col. George Eyster was killed, which to me personally was one of the roughest blows so far, I became involved in an orphanage building program as the project officer. This has really had me going in circles but it has been a very rewarding experience as well. It has given me an opportunity to travel around some to see other orphanages and to meet many other people. Most especially, it has given me a chance to work closely with some very fine Vietnamese people. It has been very encouraging to me to hear first hand how thankful these people are just for our presence here and for all we've done for them—expecially the degree of freedom they already have experienced.

This project began because we, as an Army unit, wanted to do something meaningful for the Vietnamese people and at the same time establish a lasting memorial for our dead comrades who gave their lives for this country, our country, and the freedom of the world. Realizing that the future of this country will be up to the children of today, what better way could we help than to help these poor needy children, many who have no home. This was also fitting and readily accepted by the men—who always seem taken by children wherever they go.

Our first stop was to ascertain the need—which was real then to get the government approval to go ahead. All of this came very soon as did a promise for free land. Because we just wanted to sponsor an orphanage by building it and providing the operating funds we next tried to locate a reputable group to administer and supervise the orphanage. This finally came after much discussion from the National Evangelical Church of Vietnam. This church body, which is the only significant Protestant Church group in Vietnam, is an out-growth of the Christian and Missionary Alliance over the past half century. Today the C & MA acts as an advisory group to this completely Vietnamese controlled church. It is ideal that they have accepted this because they have experience in orphange work and the very best interests of the Vietnamese people at heart. At the present time I am trying to raise some $20,000, which not only will provide much of the original construction cost but should also give us funds for our first year's operating budget of $8,000 to $10,000. We plan to begin with facilities to care for about 100 children with probable expansion to about 250 children in the future. In addition to the orphanage itself we plan to have a school so that many of the children in the area who cannot afford it otherwise might get an education. This orphanage and school is to be built at Ben Cat which a short time ago was a VC area on one corner of the previously feared Iron Triangle. To me this too witnesses to the progress we've made in the war effort—now we must also win the hearts of these people.

Well, enough of that for now but many of you have written of your interest in this project and expressed a willingness to help. Right now the main need is financial but in a couple of months we will also need items of clothing, personnal care needs, school supplies and many others. If you or any group you represent are at all interested in helping out feel free to let me know and I will keep you informed.

All of my efforts have not been in this direction though because my military obligation is still present as before—that of providing services anywhere at any time, visiting the troops and going with them on operations (which have really increased) to help them keep up their morale, counseling them with their problems—most of which interestingly enough come from home, not here—and just being a part of the staff team to keep everything going smoothly. In all, just as I have mentioned before, I still find this a very rewarding ministry even as we begin our eighth month. I am also thrilled and pleased with how well the plain old average American boy is doing in this situation—It's an honor just to be a part of this whole effort over here.

Probably one of the most interesting things for me recently happened on Easter Sunday. We were on a two-week operation in the Delta Country at that time and were moving a lot so we traveled very light—no chaplain's kit, in fact all I had was a pocket stole, prayerbook and Bible—not even a cross. Yet it seemed to many that our Sunday Sunrise service was still as meaningful as ever and the message of the Ressurection Story as we read it and sang it (without musical accompaniment) seemed even more meaningful and real in this situation. It was a real joy to have so many come together to worship at all the services we held in every place. This is all important but the most interesting part for me was that of flying by helicopter out to a destroyer to provide its crew with religious services. They were giving us naval gun support for the operation and on Thursday we received word that they would not have a chaplain available so our Brigade Commander, Colonel Brodbeck, asked if I would be willing to go and of course I was. We were very welcome but I'm afraid a grimy Army chaplain and pilot were a sight on a spotless Naval vessel. They were sure eager to know too how the war was going on dry land. But even after cleaning up a delicious dinner I'm still glad I didn't go into the Navy—no offense to my web-footed friends.

Previously I made quite an issue over getting used to the heat—well I found out you never really completely accomplish this task. February and March are what they call the hot months in our area and I think probably that is correct with the daily temperatures ranging between 100 and 115 degrees. Here in April the temperature has dropped back down to the 80's and 90's but the humidity has really gone up with the approaching monsoons. Now for the next four months we will be in the monsoon season—rain like I've never seen anywhere. The big struggle now will be to try to keep everything from getting moldy. Somehow we'll survive it all and look back on everything with a degree of humor.

Well, I think I have gone on long enough for now or you'll get bored. I hope you don't mind hearing from me in a general mimeo letter but I assure you that I am thinking of everyone individually as I write it. We all certainly appreciate your thoughts and prayers for us over here and believe me it has helped countless numbers of men pull through. I should get back to the states sometime in October and I hope Gail and I will have time to visit with many of you then.

Sincerely,

ARCHIE T. ROBERTS,
Chaplain (Captain) USA, Battalion Chaplain.

P.S.—I was honored with a quick promotion to Captain in January.

Junior Achievement of Union County, N.J., and Operation Free Enterprise

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in recent years, I have had the pleasure of bringing to the attention of our colleagues information about one of the most encouraging youth programs in the country, Junior Achievement, and in particular the accomplishments of a truly outstanding example of this program, Junior Achievement of Union County, N.J.

Situated as it is in the midst of the Nation's largest concentration of business and industry, Union County is an ideal location for an active program through which young people can be introduced to the principles and practices of our free enterprise business economy. With the cooperation and active assistance of many of our most prominent industrial firms, Junior Achievement of Union County has enlisted many hundreds of bright and enthusiastic boys and girls of high school age who have relished the challenge presented by the opportunity of operating their own manufacturing businesses.

The 1965–66 Youth Incentive and Economic Education Project of Junior Achievement, which was recently completed, was especially successful. It was highlighted by a 20-percent gain in sales of JA Company products and by the highest attendance record in the eastern JA region, and was climaxed by what must have been a most rewarding trip to Ireland for the 60 outstanding Junior Achievers of the area.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the report of this year's "Operation Free Enterprise" prepared by the very able executive vice president of Junior Achievement of Union County, Mr. J. Kenneth Roden:

HIGHLIGHTS OF "OPERATION FREE ENTERPRISE"

1965–66 YOUTH INCENTIVE AND ECONOMIC EDUCATION PROJECT OF JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT OF UNION COUNTY, INC.

"Operaton Free Enterprise," latest in a long series of youth incentive and economic education projects developed and executed by Junior Achievement in the Union County-Carteret, N.J. area, was an unqualified success. Designed to stimulate outstanding performance in all phases of Junior Achievement, all objectives were attained.

Products of the 28 junior companies were well designed and attractively packaged.

Supported by "Zero Defects" quality control and safety programs, production was efficient and kept pace with record sales.

Dollar sales of Junior Achievement company products increased 20% over the previous year.

78 Junior Achievers made individual sales exceeding $100, the record being $1,078, and the aggregate sales by this group being in excess of $14,000.

The attendance record was the highest in the Eastern Junior Achievement Region.

27 of the junior companies operated at a profit and paid dividends to stockholders; 1 company operated at a breakeven but was able to return 100% of its stockholders investment upon liquidation.

60 outstanding Junior Achievers were nominated for participating in the Operation Free Enterprise award visit to industrial, educational and cultural sites in Ireland, May 14 to 22. 24 award winners and two alternates were selected by a panel of business and community leaders after probing interviews encompassing their understanding of the principles and functions of free enteruprise, their performance in Junior Achievement, their extracurricular activities, and their knowledge of the history and economic development of Ireland.

OFFICIAL RECEPTIONS ARE BRIEFINGS

Preliminary to their visit to Ireland, the 26 Junior Achievers were complimented upon their achievements by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY who met them in his Washington office, presented Free Enterprise Award Citations, and said: "Junior Achievement of Union County's Operation Free Enterprise project has enabled you young people to broaden your knowledge and strengthen you rbelief in our profit system. Your enthusiastic endorsement and support of the economic system which has made America great is an inspiration which I am sure many young people will follow. I congratulate you, your industrial sponsors, your Advisers and Junior Achievement for this job well done."

A briefing by Department of State officials followed, emphasizing the importance of the functions and responsibilities of American Ambassadors and their staffs throughout the world. Their subsequent meeting with the Chargés d'Affaires at the American Embassy in Dublin gave the young people first-hand insight into this important aspect of their nation's international responsibilities.

ENLIGHTENING VISITS TO IRISH INDUSTRIES

At the Industrial Site at Shannon Free Airport the Junior Achievers saw new industries developing under Ireland's five-year Economic Programme and had an opportunity to discuss the importance of the industrial revolution taking effect there. Host industries were Shannon Free Airport Development Co., Ltd., E. I. Company Limited (Subsidiary of General Electric Company), Lana-Knit (Ireland) Ltd. (Subsidiary of Jonathan Logan, Inc.), Mohawk Europa Ltd., S.P.S. (International) Limited (Affiliate of Standard Pressed Steel Co.). Visits to these new factories, affiliates of American industries, and to Shannon River Veneer Mills, Ltd. at Limerick, impressed upon the young people the importance of the special incentives available in Ireland for foreign capital investment; designed to create new employment opportunities to hasten the transition from an agricultural to an industrial economy.

Personal meetings with executives of these new firms in the Shannon area, and of the longer-established industries in the Cork and Dublin area, including Henry Ford & Co., Ltd., Irish Refining Company, Ltd., Becton-Dickinson & Co., Ltd., Irish Driver-Harris Company Ltd., and the affiliates of W. R. Grace & Co., Urney Chocolates Limited and the Hughes Brothers, Ltd. Hazelbrook Dairy, resulted in very stimulating discussions of raw material procurement, production methods, personnel programs, marketing, capital investment, international trade, and general economic activities.

Witnessing the development of this young private enterprise economy emphasized to the Junior Achievers and the business people who accompanied them the values, functions, motivations and rewards of free enterprise. Most importantly, by contrast it also emphasized to them the strength of the American economy and the scope of opportunities available to them at home. They returned rededicated to the principles of free enterprise. One Junior Achiever, 16 year old Fred Berger of Hillside, N.J., sponsored by Bristol-Myers Company, expressed it this way: "It taught me that we really have a lot going for us in the United States." And Lynn Turner, 17 year old Cranford, N.J. high school senior, sponsored by The Singer Company, and named "Treasurer of the Year" by the Union County and New Jersey Societies of Certified Public Accountants, said: "Irish businessmen are similar to American businessmen, but like their employees they do not live the fast-paced lives that most American businessmen do, and therefore their results are not as fantastic."

YOUNG AMERICANS PROUD OF THEIR EDUCATIONAL ADVANTAGES

A meeting with Irish Minister for education, George Colley, and his staff, and discussions with students and professors from the Universities of Dublin and Cork, and Trinity College, as well as a visit to the new facilities of the College of Technology in Dublin, emphasized the changes engulfing the educational system in Ireland. Mr. Colley told the Junior Achievers that "Ireland is in the throes of educational change, but change for its own sake is pointless. It should be made with a view to improvement. One of the most successful ways towards this objective is to learn from the successful projects of other countries."

The Junior Achievers learned of efforts being made to raise standards of education, improve educational facilities, and prepare the young Irish to participate in the technological and industrial advancement planned for the Irish economy. Considerable emphasis was placed on the necessity of lengthening the period of learning for Irish students, many of whom leave school at age 16 or younger.

As a result of these contacts the Junior Achievers became particularly conscious and proud of the educational and employment opportunities available to them at home as contrasted with the limited opportunities for majority of young people abroad.

In Cork, executives of Ford and Irish Refining Company hosted a dinner at which the Junior Achievers met with local students. A rapport was easily and quickly established and new friendships, which undoubtedly will be lasting, developed during meaningful discussions of the American way of life, career interests, hobbies and other matters of interest to teenagers everywhere.

During this meeting the Junior Achievers made an excellent impression with serious minded, probing questions and logical, well expressed answers to questions posed to them.

BRITISH INDUSTRIALISTS EXCHANGED IDEAS WITH ACHIEVERS

Hubert G. Starley, C.B.E., Managing Director of Champion Sparking Plug Co. Ltd. of Farnham, England, flew from London to Dublin especially to entertain the Operation Free Enterprise group. Mr. Starley has been responsible for the start-up in the United Kingdom of Young Enterprise, counterpart of Junior Achievement. He and his Irish associate, John Roy, Director of Champion Sparking Plug (Ireland) Ltd., were hosts at an informal dinner at world famous Royal Hibernian Hotel in Dublin, attended by the Lord Mayor of Dublin, Eugene Timmons, and leading Irish industrialists, including Stephen O'Flaherty, Chairman, O'Flaherty Group of Companies.

Following the dinner and in lieu of formal speeches, Mr. Starley announced that he and his associates desired an informal discussion with the award winning Junior Achievers in order that they might become better acquainted and learn from each other's experiences. A spirited discussion took place between the businessmen and the Junior Achievers after which Mr. Starley commended the young people for their dedication to the principles of free enterprise and their knowledge of business fundamentals as well as their broad interest in public affairs.

IRISH HOSPITALITY EXPERIENCED AND RECIPROCATED

Each formal meeting with Irish industrialists and government officials was followed by an informal reception or dinner at which the young people were extended warm hospitality. Also, they were guests at a buffet luncheon in the home of Mr. and Mrs. T. A. Headon. Mr. Headon is Managing Director of Urney Chocolate Limited. Everywhere it was emphasized to them that their experience in Junior Achievement and the opportunity presented to them through Operation Free Enterprise was unique and unmatched in any way in Ireland.

The Junior Achievers were impressed with the hospitality and friendship extended to them by the Irish people. This was expressed by Jean High, 17 year old senior at Sacred Heart High School, sponsored by Weston Instruments Inc., after her return when she said to a newspaper reporter: "The Irish are a warm, generous and honest people, working hard to succeed in this transition from an agricultural to an industrial way of life. But I think we all agree that, regardless of the results, they will remain a people who enjoy life to its fullest."

In a goodwill gesture, the Junior Achievers and Mayor Thomas G. Dunn, representing the City of Elizabeth and the residents of the Union County-Carteret area, presented to the industrial and government hosts educational, scientific and industrial films donated by New Jersey Bell Telephone Company, Humble Oil & Refiniing Company and White Laboratories. They also distributed a small library of books on free enterprise, biographies of American industrialists, and references on New Jersey including the just-published New Jersey Almanac, and recordings of the famous Westminster Choir College choral group.

FREE ENTERPRISE ESSAYS

As part of the "Operation Free Enterprise" competition, the Junior Achievers were required to write an essay on "Why I Believe in the Free Enterprise System". Biographies of the award winning Junior Achievers, which were sent to Irish hosts and newspaper, radio and television editors, prior to arrival in Ireland, included excerpts from their essays and information about the young people's extra-curricular activities. The readers were so impressed that Junior Achievement received requests for the young people to appear on television. Also, several industrialists and educators extended special invitations for the young people to be guests in their homes to meet their families and friends.

The following excerpts from free enterprise essays are typical of the astute statements of the young people in their essays and in discussions abroad:

"When you start a business, what is your main objective? It is to make a profit . . . Individuality and incentive are most necessary to a successful system . . . This pride which I saw develop in my own company, Hopco, is one reason why I believe in free enterprise . . . If you are going to succeed in anything, you must believe in it and in your ability to conquer any problem which may arise . . . And this is the main item needed to do anything worthwhile: Character." Thomas Gallagher, 15 year old sophomore at Roselle Catholic High School, sponsored by Radio Corporation of America.

"I believe that private, not government, ownership of a nation's wealth is a positive good. The hope of success in business is in itself a positive good. The hope of success in business is in itself an incentive for consistent effort. It causes individuals to exert themselves to be creative and to seek success constantly and to produce more necessary products . . . I wish to have the opportunity to develop my capabilities at the same time I am contributing to the preservation of business," Gary L. Goodman, 18 year old senior at Thomas Jefferson High School, sponsored by IBM.

"The free enterprise system is the foundation of our democracy. It is a major factor in our daily lives, and vital to our standard of living . . . After investigating the other forms of economic systems, one cannot help but believe wholeheartly in the Free Enterprise System. There is no other system that, with proper knowledge, labor, and attitudes, can allow man such great economic freedom so that he may succeed to his utmost ability . . . The many virtuous aims of this system have benefited individuals of our society by allowing them equal opportunities to prosper in all facets of life." Joan Kruger, 18 year old senior at Linden High School, sponsored by Humble Oil & Refining Company New Jersey Sales Division.

"The search for security is perhaps the most difficult problem to overcome. People are willing to sacrifice for halfway success. They are willing to acquire enough prosperity to become one of the crowd, but they are not willing to further their achievement to its fullest measure. Despite these drawbacks, our American success story is as real and possible today as it ever has been. A person possessing the imagination, initiative, and industry can strive towards his goal . . . The Free Enterprise System makes it possible for even you and I to be a part of the great American success story. Today the sky is the limit." Patricia C. Lapidus, 16 year old junior at Mother Seton Regional High School, sponsored by Schering Laboratories.

"If a man works for something he should reap the rewards of that work. In America this is true. It is up to every individual to earn his own way and those with more aggressiveness and ability can surpass the average. Through free enterprise the motivation in inspired in the individual. He works harder because he seeks the rewards and profits that can be gained with certain effort." Gerald Rotella, 17 year old junior at Roselle Catholic High School, sponsored by Merck & Co., Inc.

TELEVISION APPEARANCES

Bunny Carr, popular moderator of the Irish television program "Teen Talk" invited 16 Junior Achievers to participate with Irish students on his program. The Junior Achievers impressed an audience of 5 million viewers with their alert, thoughtful discussion of serious questions about the American private enterprise system, America's role as a world leader, and their own social responsibilities.

Also, Mayor Dunn, J. Kenneth Roden, Executive Vice President of Junior Achievement of Union County, and two Junior Achievers were invited to appear on the "Late Late Show", Irish equivalent of the popular American "Tonight Show", also viewed by a television audience of 5 million. The Achievers, Jacinta Smolinski, 17 year old senior at Jonathan Dayton Regional High School, sponsored by White Laboratories, Inc., and Joseph Wlazlowski, 16 year old junior from Sacred Heart High School, sponsored by Schering Laboratories, were complimented by the producer and roundly applauded by the studio audience for their articulate discussion of the American business system, their Junior Achievement activities, and on their thoughtful comments as to the group's impressions of Ireland.

Tapes of these broadcasts have been obtained and will be made available to New Jersey radio and television stations.

JUNIOR ACHIEVERS GOODWILL AMBASSADORS

Everywhere the Junior Achievers were complimented on their knowledge of Irish affairs, its Economic Programme, and political and cultural activities, as well as their ability to converse intelligently about American and international affairs. The Junior Achievers were attired throughout the trip as young businessmen and women. Not only Irish residents, but tourists from Canada, Australia, Europe and the United States, met en route, made a point to compliment them on their appearance and conduct. The young people reflected great credit on Junior Achievement, the sponsoring industries, their high schools and their community.

Coments of the business and government officials with whom they associated during the week in Ireland indicate that the Operation Free Enterprise award winners did much to change the unfavorable impression of the American teen-ager being built up as a result of distortions in the world press and through American television programs distributed throughout the world. It was gratifying to receive the following comment from Mr. Robert Chalker, Charges d'Affairs at the American Embassy in Dublin: "The visit of the Junior Achievers from Union County and Carteret, New Jersey, was an outstanding success. They were examples of what we like to think of as typical of dynamic, intelligent and serious-minded American young people. They made an excellent impression everywhere they went. We consider they were a credit to their country."

PARTICIPANTS

In addition to those mentioned in this Highlight Report, the following participated in the planning and execution of "Operation Free Enterprise."

SPONSORING INDUSTRIES

Air Reduction Company.
American Cyanamid Company.
Bristol-Myers Products Division—Bristol-Myers Company.
Burry Biscuit Division—The Quaker Oats Company.
Chevron Oil Company.
E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Company, Incorporated.
FMC Corporation.
GM Assembly Division—General Motors Corporation.
General Aniline & Film Corporation.
Humble Oil & Refining Company—Bayway Refinery.
Humble Oil & Refining Company—Linden Sales District.
International Business Machines Corporation.
The Lionel Corporation.
Merck & Co., Inc.
New Departure-Hyatt Bearings Division—General Motors Corporation.
New Jersey Bell Telephone Company.
Phelps Dodge Copper Products Corporation.
Public Service Electric & Gas Company.
Purolator Products,, Inc.
Quinn & Boden Company, Inc.
Radio Corporation of America.
The Regina Corporation.
Reichhold Chemicals, Inc.
Schering Corporation.
Simmons Company.
The Singer Company.
Weston Instruments, Inc.
White Laboratories, Inc.

OTHER CIVIC AND INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

Acromark Co.
Lt. Donald Bayne Memorial Fund.
Exchange Club of Elizabeth.
Hillside Industrial Foundation.
Industrial Management Club of Elizabeth.
Linden Industrial Association.
New Jersey Manufacturers Association.
Public Relations Society of America—New Jersey Chapter.
Maude Remington Osterman Fund.
Society of Certified Public Accountants—Union County Chapter.
United States Department of State—Irish Desk.

IRISH INDUSTRIES AND GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

C.I.E.—Irish Transport Company.
Embassy of Ireland, His Excellence William P. Faye, Ambassador to the United States.

Irish Export Board.
Irish International Airlines.
Irish Tourist Board.
Television Eireann.

Call the Keeper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Nat Hentoff is a writer and a commentator on the passing scene. He is honest, intelligent, difficult, and aware. He is extremely controversial. The complacent do not and cannot appreciate him. Many will disagree with him.

He has written, among many other publications, for the Village Voice, published in my district and covering Greenwich Village but also sold nationally. His latest work is his first novel entitled "Call the Keeper" published by Viking.

The New York Times of Friday, July 8, reviewed the book, and, on balance, found it "rather likeable."

Eliot Fremont-Smith the reviewer referring to Nat Hentoff's treatment, concluded:

> He does it knowledgeably, humorously, succinctly and—once one's expectations are brought into line—effectively.

The Race Game

(By Eliot Fremont-Smith)

(Call the Keeper. By Nat Hentoff. 116 pages. Viking. $3.95.)

There are two epigraphs to Nat Hentoff's first (adult) novel. One is from a play by Bertolt Brecht: "The endless isolation of Man makes enmity impossible." The other is a saying of John the Avenger: "You are putting me on." Now John the Avenger presumably doesn't exist; he is one of Mr. Hentoff's created or amalgamated characters; so it is a bit of a question right off as to who is putting whom on. In fact, once into the book, the suspicion comes that it is the author who is being put on. If so, he takes the advice of another of his characters, to wit, "The only way to answer a put-on is to be as straight and succinct as possible." Mr. Hentoff is—and thereby answers the put-on and produces an overly programed novel. Or, perhaps, the scaffolding for a novel as yet unwritten. It is, in any case, an unwieldly structure, held together by good intentions, which may explain a minor oddity: "Call the Keeper" is at once a tedious book and a rather likeable one.

Facets of the theme are reflected in the quotes above; it is indeed about being put on, also about isolation and the frustrating uselessness of enmity, specifically Negro enmity toward white people.

The scene of the book is that one place where the races mix on at least pretend equal terms, Greenwich Village. Here the games people play include the race game, which, because enmity must constantly be deferred, is only verbally violent; when it comes to action, the nervous cry from blacks and whites alike is "cool it." Even John the Avenger, who dreams of black revolutions is forced to cool it (this after a wry, pathetically hilarious audience with a cautious Cuban Marxist theoretician).

The most he can do, when really pressed, is force his white wife and child to leave him. He knows the meagerness of the gesture, so his anger is real and touching; the trouble is, there is absolutely nothing to do with it. When a brother revolutionary, a Dostoevsky manque named Septimus, proves to the world (it takes some doing) that he's a psychopath, it merely seems another, more logical and more final way of cooling it. Before that, the most Septimus could do was pretend he may have murdered a sadistic cop—a Negro cop at that.

The implicit observation in all this is that black revolutionaries who would force concessions from "whitey" by violently dislocating white society are themselves too dislocated even to make coherent plans. "I am sure," says Horowitz, the police officer who puts Septimus away and who is hated not because he is white but because he is smart and incorruptible, "I am sure there will be a rise in terrorism for some years. Isolated, futile terrorism." Possibly to keep it futile, Horowitz, at the end of the book, quits the force to join the war on poverty. A symbol of evil, this unfeeling libertarian who is committed first and last to order, Horowitz will be successful; alone, he understands the uses of accommodation as a weapon. He is "the keeper of us all."

John the Avenger, Septimus and Horowitz are the protagonists of the novel; four others serve as a chorus and as Mr. Hentoff's alternating mouthpieces: Thomas (white), who tape-records race relations "documentaries" for a "listener-supported" radio station and sleeps with Dianne (black), an ex-Smith undergraduate who shares her Bleecker Street apartment with Billy (her brother), a radio bug who plays it cool with pot and admires the super-cool of Randal (white), who gave up junk for jazz and friendly noninvolvement.

It is a difficulty of the novel that these four voices are not distinguishable from each other, that for all their articulateness they remain patently mechanical contrivances. (What are they doing? Are they talking to us? To each other? Writing in their diaries? Being tape-recorded?)

This is the scaffolding Mr. Hentoff has, as it were, left behind. And scattered all around the edges is their, or his debris—too obvious coy and constant references explicit and implied, to Malcolm X, LeRoi Jones, self-conscious WASPs, lost liberal Jews, the Cedar Street Bar, WBAI–FM, Charlie Parker the Progressive Labor Movement, Camus, Jimmy Baldwin, group therapy, Downbeat, Erich Fromm and virtually it seems all the other familiar people, concepts and concerns that have occupied Mr. Hentoff as a long-time social critic and explainer of the militant Left to sympathetic liberals.

The concern one feels is missing, or relegated to some low place on the scale, is for the novel as a novel, its own engine, its own sources of energy and art. In these terms, Mr. Hentoff is himself a keeper. He won't let go; he must explain. Yet it should be added that he does it knowledgeably, humorously, succinctly and—once one's expectations are brought into line—effectively.

The War on Poverty in Rural Eastern Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. EVANS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Yuma Pioneer, a weekly newspaper in Yuma, Colo., has published a two-part series on the war on poverty in Yuma County. The stories were written "after much study and observation," the editor said, to provide better public knowledge and to "clear up public misconceptions" of the program.

I was impressed by the quality of these two stories and include them in the Record for the benefit of my colleagues:

A Look at the War on Poverty Being Waged in Yuma Co.

It's known by many names. . . . The Poverty Program, Title V Project, Economic Opportunity Act or E.O.A., War on Poverty, and several which are unprintable. Likewise, opinions regarding the program range along a large scope, and almost everyone can quote first-hand examples to show how good, or how bad, it is.

This is the first installment of a two-part article in which the Pioneer takes a look at the War on Poverty, as being waged in Yuma County. It's offered after much investigation, study and interviews; neither to champion the program nor ridicule it, but rather as explanation.

Floyd "Bud" Murphy is the Title V Project Director for Yuma County, and he says that a once fresh joke has long ago turned stale, sometimes offered as a greeting, "How about getting me on the Poverty Program?"

A quick look at the pay-scale figures readily indicate that those employed under the E.O.A. don't have the "chocolate mountain" that many claim. Wages are based on the number of people in the family. A man and his wife, for instance, receive only $81.72 per month plus shelter and working expenses. A three person family, whose household head is working under the program, gets $117.83; four people receive $154.94; five, $192.05; six, $229.16; and seven, $256.76.

For this, they are committed to work not less than 40 hours each week, attend night school, and cannot receive any outside compensation for "moon lighting" on jobs for revenue.

Yuma County received $258,300 to launch their War on Poverty last November, but not nearly all of this fund will be used, according to Murphy.

The first person went to work under Title V on December 20, 1965, and since then thirty-four families have been included in Yuma County. The occupations of those employed are widely varied, but with few exceptions, are working for schools, county, town, hospital, or other levels of government. Their jobs include: bridge construction, heavy equipment, landscaping, plastering, painting, carpentry, tile laying, custodian, streets and utilities, mechanic, policeman, telephone line repair, surveying, terracing, secretarial, cook, laundry and brand inspector.

Only four people have been placed with private business, including three in nursing homes and one as a garage mechanic. While the employer is not responsible for their salary, he is committed to their training and advancement, and must indicate a willingness to hire the person at the end of their training.

Of the thirty-four participants, seventeen are now self-sufficient, having received steady employment. In other words, they are off the welfare roles and pulling their own weight in society.

"There were some hard feelings, particularly early in the program, displayed by the public," according to Murphy. "Most of this stemmed from misunderstanding," he said. A trainee told the Pioneer that he hadn't detected any ridicule from the public in regards to being on the Poverty Program, however.

Participants are expected to attend schooling two nights a week at Eckley. Classes are taught by three R–J–1 instructors, held in two-hour sessions. Their goal is a General Education Diploma, which the State recognizes as equivalent to a high school education.

In addition to the Title V students, several others are receiving adult basic education under Title II. These are usually well-to-do people who merely wish to further their education, or brush up on particular subjects. Some are housewives, others are employed by private business, and still others are self-employed. They dont receive money or compensation for going to school, nor are they linked to a welfare program of any type. Most, in fact, are substantial taxpayers who financially support such programs, and many have high school diplomas.

While the program will not remain federally sponsored after this year, the educational portion is expected to continue from money channeled through state offices and sustained by the county.

Murphy said that the Title V Program does not work with alcoholics or mentally retarded people, feeling that they need a more specialized type of assistance.

Murphy is the only full-time Poverty worker in Yuma County, though he is assisted by a part-time stenographer, case worker, and three instructors.

A Denver Post editorial writer pretty well summed it up in a recent story. He said "It should be remembered that these immediate and direct benefits are only temporary tokens of greater public benefits. E.O.A.'s goal is and should be, to win the war and do yourself out of a job."

So much for the basic glimpse of Title V in Yuma County. For editorial comment, see page 2.

Next week we offer the second and concluding chapter of the story; more interesting, as a trainee of the program tells how he feels about it, its benefits.

Title V Trainee Volunteers Opinion

We took a broad look at Yuma County's Anti-Poverty Program in the Pioneer last week, dealing primarily with facts and figures within the county. This week, for the second and concluding article, we'll examine the program in personal detail, as seen by one of its participants.

Vincent Gallagher is 29 years old, father of three, and training to become a police officer under the Title V Program. He speaks openly and frankly in regards to poverty training, and it's apparent that he's genuinely grateful for the opportunity it offers.

Gallagher previously worked for plumbing companies in Yuma and Wray, supporting a family of five. Following an operation on his back, doctors ordered him to find a less strenuous occupation. But what? Previous training had been with a seisemograph crew, which brought him to Yuma in 1958, and a hitch in the Navy. He was forced to partial welfare for a couple of months following his operation, then joined the Title V Program, training for a new line of work while maintaining a degree of financial footing.

Gallagher says, "I think it's a good deal (the Poverty Program). It has got me into something I can work at without my back being a hinderance. I feel that I'm getting good training under Albert (McNichols). I hear a lot of things about the Poverty Program, but I think a lot of this comes from the people in it, themselves."

Gallagher receives $281.00 a month from Title V, and this is the only source of income he's allowed. He even has to have a fellow law officer sign violation tickets he writes, since there is a $1.00 rebate fee to the officer.

$281.00 can hardly be considered a living wage for a family of five, and certainly nothing to turn cartwheels over. Gallagher, however, considers it as a 'God sent', and a real opportunity to make a new start.

Gallagher reflects, "I have never had much money, and I'm used to getting by without it. You may want something, but you learn to just walk by it. My wife does our sewing, and makes pretty near all the children's clothes." More amazing is the fact that Gallagher is making payments on a modest home in north Yuma and fixing it up in his spare time, a tribute to careful budgeting.

Like other trainees in the Poverty Program, Gallagher is committed to work 160 hours each month at his job. Like many others, too, he puts in extra hours for the experience, without pay. He sometimes doubles as a radio dispatcher at the police station, working a 16-hour shift.

Police Chief Albert McNichols, and fellow law officers, agree that Gallagher has become a good law man, and is very serious about his duties. Gallagher isn't afraid to write traffic tickets, and to him a traffic violation is a traffic violation, regardless of the offender's social standing within the town. He recently discovered two break-ins while making routine night checks of downtown business places.

The schooling segment of the program is very good, Gallagher feels. He is attending classes twice a week at Eckley, taking math and English. He completed the eighth grade in his hometown of Crosby, North Dakota, but will take a test in the near future for the equivalent of a high school education.

The Title V training period will end in November. Gallagher says, "I hear a lot of talk about people going right back on welfare when this program is finished, and some of them probably will; but a good percentage will move into regular, self-sustaining jobs."

Gallagher likes police work, and hopes for a chance to get on the Yuma force as a regular officer. If not, he'll find an opening elsewhere, and move.

One might suppose that a law officer training under the Poverty Program might meet with hostility when writing a ticket, discrimination, or at least some kidding. Gallagher said that he hadn't noticed any.

Floyd Murphy, Title V Project Director for Yuma County, said that "most people in the program are very sincere in their desire for steady employment, and ready to put forth the effort to learn. One man worked 78 hours over his regular 160-hour training time, voluntarily, just to get experience. There was no extra pay. Many of our workers have had seasonal jobs, but aren't professionally trained. Our job is to see that they develop work skills and work habits, and don't become accustomed to loafing," Murphy commented.

And so, the War on Poverty continues. There may be "fat cats" on higher administrative levels getting fatter, we don't know; but we can pin-point a degree of merit for the program when viewed on the local level.

Pending political campaigns will probably toss Title V back and forth with charges and countercharges. If our readers realize that the program is not a cure-all, as some will claim; or a complete waste of money and time, as others will say, then this brief glimpse of Anti-Poverty on the local level will be worth while.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Comptroller Arthur Levitt's Address at the Conference of Mayors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Arthur Levitt is one of the most devoted and noncontroversial personalities who is serving the State of New York.

I am most fortunate to have shared a close friendship with him and his family for nearly a quarter a century. He was a classmate of my late husband, Edward L. Kelley, during their academic year at Columbia College.

Because of the fact that I share the views which Mr. Levitt has expressed in his many endeavors over the years, I am delighted to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an address made by the Honorable Arthur Levitt, who is comptroller of the State of New York, at the annual meeting of the Conference of Mayors, held at Grossingers Hotel, on Tuesday, June 14, 1966:

ADDRESS BY COMPTROLLER ARTHUR LEVITT AT THE CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, GROSSINGERS HOTEL, GROSSINGERS, N.Y., JUNE 14, 1966

I am pleased to be with you this morning and to once again address the Annual Meeting of the Conference of Mayors. It is pleasant to be among old friends and to establish new ones.

Your forum offers an excellent opportunity for local and State officials to meet and discuss problems of mutual interest and concern.

Today my topic is one which personally concerns each of us—retirement benefits for public servants.

Many among us today can probably recall the days when a pension was considered an outright gift from a benevolent employer. Few of our parents were fortunate enough to work for such an employer and it wasn't until the establishment of Social Security that there was any hope of financial security in any measure—aside from the meager savings that one could accrue over a lifetime—during the years of retirement.

But Social Security wasn't enough and gradually over the years—through the power of unionism, collective bargaining and legislators concerned with the problems of a growing population of persons over 65—fixed income retirement plans began to expand.

Today, with inflation our paramount domestic economic concern, fixed retirement income is inadequate to meet the day-to-day needs of retirees, whether they be in private industry or public service. You simply can't buy a dollar's worth of groceries with a 40-cent dollar.

One of my most important responsibilities as State Comptroller is that of sole trustee of the New York State Employees' Retirement System.

It is an area in which I have a personal interest, for I strongly believe that a government employee—at any level—deserves, as part of his career benefits, a pension which will have meaningful value in his retirement years.

Government, from the standpoint of employee satisfaction, must be the leader in obtaining adequate pension benefits. It is also prudent that government assume this leadership, when we consider the fact that, one way or another, our society will not tolerate depressed living standards for its senior citizens who live on retirement incomes. If retired public servants are unable to provide for the necessities of life out of their pension incomes, it is logical to assume that, like retirees on inadequate private pensions, they will turn to government for various forms of assistance.

It is therefore economical in the long run for government to provide an adequate retirement income for its employees in order that they can fully provide for their own support after retirement rather than being compelled to resort to government welfare handouts.

It is for this reason, in part, that much of the legislation which I suggested this year in Albany has been pointed toward improvement of the New York State Employees' Retirement System.

Of all these proposals—some 31—none will have greater economic impact upon the retired public servant than my plan calling for an automatic retirement income adjustment based upon changes in the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumers' Price Index.

Quite simply, this bill would gear monthly pension checks to realistic price factors. If the cost of living index rose to a significant level—my formula suggests any three per cent change as a trigger point—then the pension would be increased similarly.

In other words, the pension payment would be tied to the economy. The monthly dollar pension income would reflect current price trends. The pensioner wouldn't be caught between the rising tide of inflation and an income based upon an earlier economic period in which the dollar had more purchasing power.

I needn't remind this audience of the hundreds of loyal public servants who retired after long years of dedicated work who are now living in poverty because their pensions were geared to horse and buggy living costs.

Government has a special responsibility in this matter because rising living costs are directly related to increased government expenditures and higher taxes. The burden has been especially heavy on our senior citizens who, though they have less need of these facilities, are still compelled to pay increased property taxes for support of government programs.

My plan is justified and I sincerely hope, once it is established, every level of government will take advantage of the permissive clause of the bill to provide all public servants with the protection necessary against the ravages of inflation.

Those of you who follow legislative news probably know that the bill was passed earlier this year in both houses of the State Legislature with overwhelming bi-partisan support only to be vetoed at the hands of the Governor.

Fortunately, a similar companion bill is still in the Legislative hopper with revisions which should fit the necessary reforms recommended by the Governor. To date it has been approved by the Assembly and is now before the Senate.

I sincerely hope this measure will win the support of the Senate and the approval of the Governor. Although it is less than I desired, it is a step forward—even on an experimental one-year basis—for public servants in New York State.

Let me point out that the bill provides for financing any additional cost directly from State Retirement System earnings. There is no burden on the taxpayer to provide this benefit.

One of the reasons why this measure can be funded with proceeds from Retirement System earnings is the remarkable investment history of the System's fund during the past 11 years.

With the able assistance of an Investment Advisory Committee, numbering experts in the field of finance, economics and investment, we have expanded the Retirement System portfolio from $774 million in 1955, the year I took office, which produced an average yield of only 3.19 per cent to a current portfolio of more than $2.5 billion with an average earning level of 4.47 per cent.

The New York State Employees' Retirement System is one of the world's largest; its massive funds involve careful management and constant attention. Its investments exceed that of many foreign nations.

But despite its size and complexity, its administrators have never lost sight of the human value factor which guides us in every decision we make.

Working to guarantee decent pension income is a major battlefront of our operations. Its dimensions cover more than 300,000 members and more than 43,000 pensioners now in retirement. The System is sensitive to the needs and problems of government employees in service of the State and its municipalities, employees whose skills, devotion and labor have helped this State achieve its present affluence. I hope you will join us in support of retirement legislation that will insure each of you economic dignity in retirement. Thank you.

Another Chapter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, for many years, the people of Prince Edward County, Va., have been waging a legal fight to retain the control of their public schools. Throughout all of this period, these people have conducted themselves in a most commendable way in trying to meet the demands which have been made upon them by certain minority pressure groups and by the courts.

Nowhere in America has there been a more graphic picture of the impact of the Supreme Court decision upon public education, then in Prince Edward County, and nowhere has the defense of constitutional principles been more graphically presented.

During the course of this encounter between the people of Prince Edward County and the courts, the editor of the Farmville Herald, Mr. J Barrye Wall, has been a continuing voice of reason in steering the course of the actions there.

He has written many splendid editorials over the years, and his writings have provided a chronicle of the times. I take privilege in including, with my remarks, another editorial, which appeared on June 24, 1966, in his paper, under the title "Another Chapter."

I commend this to the reading of the Members of the House:

[From the Farmville (Va.) Herald, June 24, 1966]

Another Chapter

Announcement on Monday of the Fourth Circuit Court's decision holding the Board of Supervisors in contempt came as a bombshell to the citizens of the County. In the long 15 years of litigation in this county the Board of Supervisors and all others in the efforts to maintain local control of education have been exceedingly careful to litigate differences strictly within the law. No untoward incident has occurred and personalities have been held to a minimum. It has been entirely a legal battle before the courts. That it has taken 15 years, for the courts to settle fundamental and constitutional questions is of some moment. Certainly it indicates that the original decision of 1954 was on "thin ice" legally and not until the Act of Congress, (the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965) was there much legal substance upon which the courts could act. Yet, through this entire litigation, the Board of Supervisors, and the people of Prince Edward fought for their rights with meticulously legal actions.

Originally in 1955, there was but one defense, namely, to take the position to refuse to pay for integrated public schools, or schools over which local control was lacking. This action led to the unfortunate closing of public schools in Prince Edward County. Lack of legal decision let the schools of the county remain closed until the maze of legal questions were finally resolved when the U.S. Supreme Court, on threat of contempt, forced the Board of Supervisors to levy taxes and reopen public schools in 1964, which now practically have been taken over by the federal courts and/or the federal bureaus.

Virginia by law provided a system of educational grants to parents who preferred not to use the public schools to educate their children. The parents of Prince Edward County used the grants one year, 1960–61, to establish their own schools under their control. But in 1961, ten days prior to school opening, the right to the grants was denied until public schools had been provided. These parents continued to operate their own schools on an independent their own or from private funds donated for that purpose. In 1964, when the Board of Supervisors had provided for reopening of public schools, parents applied to the State of Virginia for the educational assistance for the past year 1963–64. The State Board of Education agreed, but a NAACP attorney in a historic flight to Charlotte N.C., obtained from Justice Bell a temporary injunction, which subsequently became a permanent injunction against reimbursement of the 1963–64 grants. However, the Court declined to enjoin future grants. With the former injunction of the District Court removed by the provision of public schools, the Board of Supervisors was free to act on future grants duly appropriated and then in the treasury of the county. This they did on August 4, after denying an informal request sent by the Chief Judge through a clerk to attorneys that no tuition grants would be paid pending an appeal. Acting as swiftly as did the NAACP attorney, they paid the first half of tuition grants for the coming year 1964–65. The NAACP attorneys admitted they were caught "flat-footed."

Now, two-years later, the Fourth Circuit Court in a 3–2 decision declares the Board of Supervisors in contempt and orders them to repay the county treasury $180,000 by recovery or otherwise.

A sordid chapter it is.

CONTEMPT OF COURT

Chief Judge Haynesworth of the Fourth Circuit Court in a dissenting opinion, quoted the law on contempt of court:

He says:

"It is clear that this Court has an inherent power to punish contempts. It was originally defined by the seventeenth section of the Judicary Act of 1789 as the power to punish by fine or imprisonment all contempts of authority in any case or hearing before the Court. But the power has since been limited and redefined by the Act of Congress of March 2, 1831, now USC No. 401. The Statute prescribes:

"'A court of the United States shall have power to punish by fine or imprisonment, at its discretion, such contempt to its authority, *and none other**, as

"'(1) Misbehavior of any person in its presence or so near thereto as to obstruct the administration of justice;

"'(2) Misbehavior of any of its officers in their official transactions;

"'(3) Disobedience or resistance to its lawful writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command.

And he observes further: "Measuring the facts in the present case by the word of Congress, I am unable to find basis in the statute for a contempt citation. Phrases (1) and (2) of the statute are not applicable here. The majority finds, under phrase (3), that there was a disobedience or resistance to a lawful writ, process, order, rule, or command of this Court. Yet none in fact existed to be disobeyed or resisted."

* * *

The fact is that the Prince Edward Board of Supervisors paid out upon legally executed requests a sum of tuition grants entirely *from county* funds, legally assessed and appropriated for that purpose. It was the first time since 1961 that the Board was free to act, and the last time because the federal courts have denied the parents of Prince Edward County the right to receive these benefits which are and have been legally constituted by the Acts of the Virginia General Assembly and ordinances of the County of Prince Edward.

The parents of every other county in Virginia have received this educational assistance, but not Prince Edward. Why? Could it be discrimination? Could it be because Prince Edward had the temerity to contend for its rights for a period of 15 years?

[From Richmond (Va.) News Leader, June 21]

Talking About Contempt

After so long a time, the mind becomes numb to incredible decisions from the Federal courts. Thus one views yesterday's pronouncement of the Fourth U.S. Circuit Court, in the continuing matter of Prince Edward County, with neither shock nor outrage, but with a certain sense of the inevitable recurring. Judges Albert V. Bryan and Simon Sobeloff, as two of the chief umpires in this game, have blundered with one bad call after another. Why should anything better be expected of them now?

Yesterday Judges Bryan and Sobeloff, allied with Judge J. Spencer Bell who knows better, contrived an opinion out of thin air and lese majeste, holding the Prince Edward board of supervisors in contempt of court for an action taken two years ago. Their affronted eminences ordered the six supervisors, "personally and in their own right," to restore to the county treasurer, "through recapture or otherwise," some $180,000 in county funds paid out in tuition grants on the night of August 5, 1964. It is an aspect of the dream world which judges inhabit that these six countrymen do not have $180,000, never had it, and would find it impossible to recover these public funds from the parents who disbursed the grants long ago.

The important thing in this case is not the $180,000. It is not the conduct of the Prince Edward supervisors (though their conduct was misguided, deplorable, inadvised, and keenly regrettable). It is rather the conduct of the three circuit judges in letting their pique get the best of their judgment. They thought the Prince Edward supervisors had pulled a fast one in their midnight caper, and doubtless the supervisors did just that. But the Federal statute defining contempt of court is crystal clear. Under circumstances such as those in the Prince Edward case, persons may be punished for contempt only for disobedience or resistance to a Federal court's "lawful writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command."

The supervisors simply are not guilty of violating that statute. They may have behaved very badly, or precipitately, or mischievously, but on the night in question, they did not disobey or resist any lawful writ, process, order, rule, decree or command. None was in existence. They took slick advantage of a momentary hiatus in the stream of court orders. In effect, they stole home while the pitcher was looking the other way. Time hadn't been called. The ball was still in play. For a court to cite them for contempt, nearly two full years later, is simply absurd.

Which is to say, it is what we have to expect from Fourth Circuit judges in suits having racial overtones. In a non-legal sense, the supervisors may have had contempt for the court; it is a feeling not sharply confined. But what is to be said of the contempt of circuit judges for the law that limits their own jurisdiction?

"'* Emphasis added. The majority opinion appears to have overlooked these three words.'"

Ebbing Treasury Supply Hikes Silver Futures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the silver supply in the United States is not keeping pace with its consumption. Cognizant of this fact, the Congress acted last year to eliminate the silver from dimes and quarters and reduce the silver in half dollars. However, by the end of this year, the Treasury—the largest source of silver supply—will have only 600 million ounces left. In a couple of years, the Treasury may stop pegging the price of silver and then silver prices would soar. This is a most disturbing trend and could encourage hoarding, a contigency the Treasury apparently is willing to face.

Mr. Henry Kadri, writing in the June 27 issue of Barron's explains the silver problems today and what we can expect in the future. I have unanimous consent that "Ebbing Treasury Supply Hikes Silver Futures" be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

Ebbing Treasury Supply Hikes Silver Futures

(By Henry V. Kadri)

Since early in March, prices of silver futures, particularly the distant options, have strengthened and daily volume has jumped, both moves reflecting expectations that the U.S. Treasury—the biggest source of supply—soon will run out of salable silver.

In this event, the Treasury would be forced to abandon efforts to peg the price of silver at its monetary value of $1.2929 per fine troy ounce. Such a freeing of the market would push silver beyond $1.3834, at which point the face value of pre-1965 half dollars, quarters and dimes would be worth their respective silver content.

PREMATURE PRICES?

The Treasury, however, believing that ample stocks will become available during the present introduction of new silverless coinage, says it intends to continue providing silver at $1.2929 through mid-1968. In its view, the recent speculation in silver futures is premature. Similar rallies have occurred, particularly in the spring and fall, ever since silver futures trading resumed on June 12, 1963. And apart from doubts of the ability of the U.S. Treasury to continue to peg prices, some of the domestic and foreign buying represents hedging against currency devaluations.

Owing to the availability of Treasury silver at $1.2929, premiums on futures in recent years have consistently vanished as contracts neared delivery time. The July future, for example currently is selling for around $1.29 per troy ounce but well below its November high of $1.329.

The September contract, meanwhile, has dropped from a peak of $1.328 last November 16 to a low of $1.298 on March 25; it currently is quoted around $1.30. The February 1967 delivery, which rose from a March 11 low of $1.316 to a high of $1.3425 on May 3, currently is selling around $1.332. The most distant May 1967 option is selling at $1.351, vs. a high of $1.3575 on May 31 and a low of $1.344 on June 2.

FOR THE BULLS

While the recent buying of silver futures again may prove unprofitable—the big winners of late have been the short sellers—time seems to be working in favor of bulls who see prices ultimately rising to $1.50 and to perhaps $2.00 or more, with even $4.00 mentioned by some. As has been the case for years, demand continues to outdistance supply.

Beginning in 1959, rising U.S. industrial and coinage demands for silver exceeded market supplies and resulted in large withdrawals from the U.S. Treasury's free (nonmonetized) silver stocks, which dropped from 202 million ounces at the end of 1958 to 28 million ounces on November 29, 1961. At this point, the Treasury suspended sales, which had been made at 91 cents per ounce.

Subsequently, the market price of silver moved steadily upwards to $1.2929 in September 1963. This followed the June 4, 1963, passage to the Silver Act, which repealed all previous silver legislation, authorized the Administration—which quietly had retired most $5 and $10 silver certificates—to issue $1 Federal Reserve notes, eliminated the profits tax and allowed the redemption of $1 silver certificates for silver bullion or pellets.

World silver production—largely a byproduct or co-product of base metal output (copper, lead and zinc) and dependent upon the silver content of ores mined—has increased only modestly in recent years, averaging under 220 million ounces annually during the past three years. Meanwhile, owing to sharply rising industrial demand (photographic uses, sterling articles, electrical and electronic uses, brazing alloys, etc.) and growing coinage requirements, world consumption has soared.

In 1961, consumption totaled 376.6 million ounces, against output of 221.5 million ounces. Consumption in 1962 came to an estimated 375.4 million ounces, vs. output of 208.6 million ounces. The gap between output and usage widened in 1963 to 308.1 million ounces, in 1964 to 337.4 million. In 1965, the shortage reached 486.8 million ounces, as world production totaled 221.5 million ounces, while total consumption—including 320.3 million ounces for U.S. coinage—shot to 708.3 million ounces.

LOT OF BULLION

With consumption exceeding production by such a wide margin, total Treasury silver bullion (excluding silver dollars and small amounts of silver subsidiary coin) fell from 1,691.5 million ounces in 1963 to only 801.3 million ounces in 1965. This year, through mid-June, these stocks dwindled further to only 694.8 million ounces. However, the Treasury's free silver balance in mid-June stood at only 228 million ounces. Assuming an additional 25 to 50 million ounces were contained in other coinage metal on hand, the silver available for sale on that date can be roughly placed at between 250 and 275 million ounces.

Yet the market seems to be saying that the amount of silver the Treasury has for sale is even less. Such a view would have a strong foundation only if, as some suspect, war and defense requirements call for a silver stockpile of 165 million ounces, rather than treating silver stocks as an informal reserve for critical national needs and even for use to maintain the present silver price. Deducting the stockpile objective of 165 million ounces from the June 10 silver balance, plus silver in other coinage metal as indicated above, would leave a mere 85 to 110 million ounces readily available for sale—enough to last months rather than years.

NO NEW CARTWHEELS

The Silver Act of 1965 eliminated silver from dimes and quarters, cut the silver content of half dollars from 90% to 40%, and barred the striking of new silver dollars for five years. Since then, the Mint has been producing billions of cupro-nickel coins. Because of reduced coinage needs this year, it is estimated that about 100 million ounces of silver will be used for U.S. coins in 1965, and industrial demand will call on Treasury stocks for another 100 million ounces, reducing the inventory to around 600 million ounces by December 31, 1966.

Leland Howard, Director of Domestic Gold and Silver Operations for the U.S. Treasury recently stated: "We expect to get through the next two or three years and have some silver left. Then we will let the Commission created by the Coinage Act decide about continuing to peg the price of silver. The Treasury will continue to maintain the price of silver during the transition period, and there appears to be no problem involved."

Nevertheless, purchasers of silver futures appear to be betting that the price of silver is going up. Many believe that the coin hoarders and collectors will not release much, if any, of their huge holdings of silver dollars, bars, half-dollars, quarters and dimes This being the case, like Lord Gresham, they are saying that bad money will drive the good out of circulation.

Russia's Air Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the principal article in the May 19, 1966, issue of Aeroplane, the international air transport journal, a leading British aviation magazine, is based on a recent book, "The Air Code of the U.S.S.R.," written by my constituent, Col. Denis A. Cooper, U.S. Air Force retired, of Arlington, Va., and published by one of the oldest legal publishers in the United States, the Michie Co., of Charlottesville, Va. Colonel Cooper, who holds doctorate degrees from both European and U.S. universities, is an expert on foreign aviation law.

Under unanimous consent I include the above-mentioned article which, among other things, has some cogent thoughts on United States-U.S.S.R. commercial aviation relations, in the Record. These are provocative thoughts, and I am confident that many Members on both sides of the aisle share the author's views.

The article follows:

Russia's Air Code

(Note.—If there is one reason why Russian air transport is so mystifying to the outsider, it is because of a communications curtain through which only chinks of light can pass. Up till now there has not even been an authentic translation of the Official Air Code which governs all air transport in Russia. Thanks to the initiative of the Michie Company—law publishers of Charlottesville, Virginia—this gap has now been filled by a distinguished translator, Lt. Col. Denis Cooper. "Aeroplane" is fortunate to have this opportunity of reproducing Col. Cooper's introductory essay. Those who are professionally concerned with Soviet aviation will, of course, wish to study the complete text.)

1. GENERAL

Air transportation constitutes an essential component of the Soviet Union's passenger and cargo transportation system. In accordance with the prevailing State concept, however, air transportation is a Government function occupying much the same position as railroad and maritime transportation. Thus, public air transportation is simply a Government monopoly, the Government being the sole public air carrier. Consequently, breach of that monopoly by unlawful utilization, for profit, of public means of transportation constitutes a criminal offense.

The public air transportation system is operated through a single Government air carrier, known as Aeroflot, which is subject to the regulation and control of the Central Administration of the Civil Airfleet (*Glavnoe Upravlenie Grazhdanskogo Vozdushnogo Flota*). The functions and powers of this Government agency resemble those of the United States Civil Aeronautics Board and of the Federal Aviation Agency, combined.

The Central Administration of the Civil Airfleet was, until recently, an agency under the jurisdiction of the Council of Ministers of the USSR (*Soviet Ministrov SSSR*), which is the highest executive and administrative organ of State power of the Soviet Union. In 1964, there was created a Ministry of the Civil Airfleet (*Ministerstvo Grazhdanskoi Aviatsii*), headed by the former Chief of the Central Administration of the Civil Airfleet, E. F. Loginov, as Minister of Civil Aviation of the USSR (*Minister Grazhdanskoi Aviatsii SSSR*). Consequently, jurisdiction over the Central Administration of the Civil Air fleet passed from the Council of Ministers of the USSR to the Ministry of the Civil Airfleet.

In principle, foreign aircraft may operate in the Soviet Union under authority granted by the Central Administration of the Civil Airfleet for each individual flight, or for scheduled flights pursuant to appropriate international agreements. Agreements providing for scheduled air transportation between the USSR and other countries are now in effect with 38 nations. These include almost all West European countries (except those of the Iberian peninsula); most Arab countries; Cuba; as well as several countries of West and East Africa and of the Far East.

2. THE SOVIET AIR CODE

All Soviet civil aviation, and air navigation in general, except aviation and air navigation activities engaged in by the aviation industry insofar as necessary to test and experiment with aircraft, is governed by a special statute, the "Air Code of the USSR", promulgated Dec. 26, 1961, and ratified April 24, 1962.

The Air Code contains one hundred and forty five (145) sections and one Appendix. The latter describes the flag and emblem of the Civil Airfleet of the USSR. The sections are incorporated into 10 chapters under the following headings:

1. General Principles (Sections 1–8).
2. Aircraft (Sections 9–17).
3. Aircraft Crew (Sections 18–26).
4. Aerodromes and Airports (Sections 27–43).
5. Flights in USSR Airspace (Sections 44–69).
6. International Flights (Sections 70–80).
7. Air Transportation of Passengers, Baggage, Cargo and Mail (Sections 81–119).
8. International Air Transportation of Passengers, Baggage and Cargo (Sections 120–136).
9. Utilization of Civil Aviation and Civil Aeronautics in Various Branches of the National Economy (Sections 137–140).
10. Penalties Imposed Administratively by the Central Administration of the Civil Airfleet Attached to the Council of Ministers of the USSR (Sections 141–145).

The Code concerns itself solely with civil aviation and civil aeronautics, in general. Mililtary and para-military aviation, as well as flight activities engaged in by the aviation industry for test and like purposes, are not covered by its provisions. Unlike its United States counterpart, the Soviet Air Code contains no criminal penalties for violation of any of its provisions. However, where violations thereof result in consequences covered by the general criminal laws, the latter apply.

3. AIR SOVEREIGNTY

Section 1 of the Air Code states that "The USSR exercises full and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace of the USSR". "Airspace" is there defined as the airspace over land, inland and coastal waters considered as such by the laws of the USSR. However, an official Soviet textbook gives a broader definition to the term "airspace". There it is defined as "the column of air over Soviet territory by land and by sea as well as the troposphere and the stratosphere".

A like view is expressed by A. Kislov and S. Krylov, of the USSR, in an article written in 1956, discussing the 1935 Soviet Air Code, which was substantially identical with the present Air Code as regards the definition of the term "airspace". According to these writers there is no upward area limit to sovereignty. Hence, they maintain that exclusive sovereignty over airspace extends to infinity.

The Air Code also contains provisions dealing with overflight of Soviet territory by pilotless craft. Unless authorized by Soviet authorities, pilotless craft are forbidden to navigate in USSR airspace. Consent thereto is conditioned upon disclosure to the Soviet authorities of the craft's flight control devices. Since present-day pilotless craft do not fly in *navigable* airspace, this provision constitutes, in effect, a statutory affirmation of the extension of Soviet airspace sovereignty into outer space. This, however, is in accord with international law, since the Chicago Convention, too, prohibits the unauthorized passage of pilotless aircraft over the territory of a contracting State.

4. AIRCRAFT

The Soviet Air Code contains no definition of the term "aircraft". It defines, however, the term "civil aircraft" by considering as such any contrivances other than those operated by the Armed Forces. Hence, spacecraft, missiles, rockets, etc., are "civil aircraft" within the meaning of the Soviet Air Code, as long as they are not operated by the military establishment.

All Soviet civil aircraft must be entered in the State Register of Civil Aircraft of the USSR. It is to be noted, in this connection, that the Soviet Air Code has adopted the principle of preference of Soviet registration, in that registration in the USSR automatically invalidates any prior foreign registration, at least in so far as Soviet law is concerned. If, however, an aircraft registered in the USSR is subsequently registered abroad the foreign registration will not be recognized by the Soviet Union unless preceded by cancellation of the USSR registration.

Civil aircraft, foreign as well as Soviet, must display their identification markings and may, of course, not be operated without an airworthiness certificate. Authority to prescribe the procedure for issuance thereof, and for periodic reinspection of airworthiness, rests in the Central Administration of the Civil Airfleet. All aircraft, Soviet as well as foreign, are required to carry aboard certain documents, such as certificates of registration and of airworthiness, and a log book; foreign documentation is given recognition if in compliance with the law of the State of registry.

Aircraft, entered in the State Register of Civil Aircraft of the USSR, may be expunged from the register in case of: (1) withdrawal from operation; (2) destruction; (3) when missing; and (4) sale or transfer, in accordance with established procedure, to a foreign State, foreign juridical entities or aliens.

5. FLIGHTS WITHIN U.S.S.R. AIRSPACE

All navigation in Soviet airspace is subject to Soviet laws and regulations. Consequently, all aircraft, Soviet and foreign, are governed by Soviet law when in Soviet airspace, and the former are so governed even when abroad, unless otherwise provided by the laws of the host country.

Pursuant to the Soviet Air Code every flight across Soviet frontiers is regarded as an "international flight". Soviet aircraft require therefore, authorization of the Central Administration of the Civil Airfleet. Foreign aircraft crossing Soviet frontiers must adhere to a prescribed air route while in Soviet airspace and utilize only designated airports.

Unauthorized frontier crossing, deviation from the prescribed air route, altitude, landing places, or other flight rules may engender mandatory landing orders as well as criminal liability. Deviation from the flight plan, however, is authorized when the gravity of the situation demands instant decision to do so, in which case the aircraft commander must immediately notify the traffic control authority of the decision thus made. In order that the traffic control authorities may always be informed of the aircraft's flight position, aircraft in flight must maintain constant radio communication with the appropriate traffic control service. In case of interruption of such communication, the aircraft must, if resumption of communication becomes impossible, land at the nearest airport and advise the traffic control authority of its location.

Although the USSR is not a signatory of the Chicago Convention, these provisions appear to have been enacted with a view toward conformity with international practices established thereby.

6. AIRCRAFT CREWS

Because of the Soviet concept of national security and public safety, the Soviet Air Code requires Soviet citizenship for the crews manning Soviet civil aircraft. Exceptions to this rule may be made in accordance with a procedure established by the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

The Air Code provides for training, rating, licensing, and identification of aircraft operating personnel, but contains no provision regarding licensing or recognition of licenses of crew members of foreign aircraft. However, a sampling of a number of bilateral aviation agreements entered into between the USSR and various countries shows that this matter is covered therein on the basis of reciprocity. It is to be noted, in this connection, that take-off clearance includes inspection as to availability of a complete and properly licensed crew.

In the event of aircraft distress, no crew member may abandon the aircraft unless authorized by its commander.

7. THE AIRCRAFT COMMANDER

The Soviet Air Code establishes the concept of the aircraft "commander" (*komandir*), a feature not found in the United States Federal Aviation Act. In Soviet law he is regarded as the agent of the aircraft as well as of the cargo owner, when cargo is carried abroad. As such, he has authority to enter into any transaction which the aircraft and/or cargo may require under emergency conditions. He must use every means in his power to safeguard life and limb of passengers and crew, as well as of property aboard. In case of distress, he is the last to abandon the aircraft. He is also required to render assistance to aircraft and vessels in distress, as well as to their passengers and crews, provided that he can do so without endangering his own aircraft, passengers or crew.

In order to enable him effectively to dischange his duties, the law provides that his orders must be unquestioningly obeyed by all persons aboard. In case of failure to obey, or of actions by passengers or crew endangering flight safety, he is required and empowered to use any means deemed necessary to meet the situation.

8. PASSENGER AIR TRANSPORTATION

The Soviet Air Code provides that civil aircraft may, among other things, carry passengers, baggage, mail and cargo, and that appropriate tariff reulations are issued by the Central Administration of the Civil Airfleet in accordance with a procedure established by the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

As a general rule the issuance of a passenger ticket by the air carrier evidences a transportation-by-air-contract between passenger and air carrier.

A passenger ticket is valid only on the route and date indicated thereon. The date is extended if the flight is cancelled by Aeroflot or if the passenger cannot participate therein because of sickness certified by an accredited medical institution. Passengers are not reimbursed for lost tickets and neither are duplicates or certificates evidencing the purchase of tickets issued. A passenger missing an aircraft may obtain a new ticket only upon payment of a price differential of 25 per cent of the original ticket cost; in the alternative he may cash in the ticket with a forfeiture of 25 per cent of the original ticket cost. Reimbursement of the remaining 75 per cent takes place within 10 days.

With the above in mind, it is clear that neither passenger nor air carrier has the right to renege on the contract, except that a passenger may cancel his flight, and be reimbursed within the aforesaid limitations, for the paid fare in the event of:

(a) illness certified by a medical institution;

(b) delayed departure of the aircraft at the point of flight origin, or substitution of the aircraft with a different type of aircraft;

(c) return of the aircraft to the point of origin without completion of the flight; and

(d) passenger notice to the carrier of flight cancellation, but not later than within the time limit prescribed by the transportation regulations.

In the event that a passenger cancels his flight later than said time limit, a prescribed fee is deducted from the refunded transportation fare. This fee, however, amounts to 25 per cent of the tariff rate for one-way transportation.

Aside from the air carrier's obligation to refund the paid air fare in the above specified instances, the passenger air carrier in international traffic is also liable in damages for delayed arrival. No such liability is provided for in domestic traffic, and agreements between the parties tending to alter the statutory liability of the contracting parties to a passenger air transportation contract, or for that matter to any air transportation contract, are void.

As regards tort liability, whether arising out of a passenger air transportation contract or otherwise, it is founded upon the principle, recognized in all civil codes of the Soviet Union Republics, which, in essence, establishes that he who causes damage to persons or property of another is obligated to make compensation therefore.

Compensation practice

However, Soviet law does not recognize compensation for mental anguish, pain and suffering (*injuria absque damno*). Also, compensation for bodily injury to or death of persons may not be awarded, unless accompanied by financial loss.

Hence, in cases of bodily injury or death, compensation is payable for economic damage actually suffered, but where the victim or his next of kin, as the case may be, are eligible for social insurance or any other similar benefits, compensation is payable to the extent only that the financial loss exceeds the social insurance benefits. Thus, the tendency of Soviet law is to restore the victim to his economic position preceding the tort. To this end, Article 410, *RSFSR Civil Code*, provides: "Compensation for damage shall consist of restoration of the former condition, and insofar as restoration is impossible—to compensation for the losses suffered."

The amount of compensation for personal injury depends upon the degree (percentage) of disability in relation to the average yearly earnings; in case of temporary disability, in relation to the two months' earnings preceding the injury. The right to compensation begins with the date of injury. In the event of death, the right to compensation belongs to the dependents of the deceased who have no other means of support.

Personal insurance

In domestic air transportation passengers are subject to mandatory flight insurance amounting only to a maximum of 300 roubles (i.e., approximately $300), the premium for which is included in the fare. Incidentally, where the insurance carrier is called upon to make payments to an individual as a result of injury or death suffered in an air accident, it may seek reimbursement from the air carrier to the extent of payments made to the injured party.

Another feature of Soviet law is that compensation for bodily injury or death may be payable in the form of an annuity rather than in a lump sum. Where the defendant is an alien, e.g., a foreign air carrier, the total amount adjudicated may be ordered paid by it into the Soviet social insurance fund for disbursement to the successful plaintiff in the form of an annuity.

As regards the air carrier's liability for injury to or death of persons, the Soviet Air Code distinguishes between domestic and international transportation. Thus, because an aircraft is regarded in Soviet law as a "source of increased hazard", an air carrier in domestic air transportation is held to absolute liability for injury to or death of a passenger, even where it occurred as a result of *force majeure* (*stikhinnoe bedstvie; nepreodolimaia sila*); i.e., either an emergency caused by the elements of nature or an event which could have been prevented by neither the air carrier nor any other person, even by taking all precautionary measures in accordance with the present-day state of science and technology (e.g. storm flood, earthquake, etc.). In such instance, however, the carrier may be exonerated if it be shown that the death or injury, or aggravation of the latter, was intended by the victim, or resulted as a consequence of his own gross negligence.

In international air transportation, the law governing aviation tort liability is founded upon the Warsaw Convention of 1929, which the Soviet Union signed and ratified on Aug. 20, 1934. However, where the Convention does not apply, or is silent, the Air Code and civil law, in general, are applicable.

Thus, in international air transportation the air carrier, unless otherwise provided by international agreement, is relieved of liability upon proof that the death or injury occurred notwithstanding its measures to avoid the same, or that it was impossible to take such measures. Liability is further nonexistent upon evidence that fault, i.e., intent or negligence, of the victim himself was either causative of or contributory to the damage.

In connection with the foreging, it is well to note that the above principles apply to passengers only, and that the protection of the Air Code is not extended to the aircraft crew, for both Sections 101 as well as 127 of the Air Code specifically refer to passengers only. The aircraft crew, on the other hand, is provided for by Article 91 of the Fundamentals of Civil Legislation.

Neither do the above principles apply to third persons or property on the ground, or to those in another aircraft, or to another aircraft in case of collision. As to these, the Soviet law takes the earlier mentioned position that aerial navigation is a hazardous activity. Hence, it makes the air carrier an insurer of persons and property, subject only to the defences of intentional misconduct or gross negligence on the part of the person injured.

Thus, an Act of God or *force majeure* does not constitute a valid defence. It follows that the owner of a civil aircraft is liable for any material damage caused by aircraft in flight, taking off or landing, or by any article falling from aircraft, to any person or property on land, water or in the air, without proof of negligence or intention, except where the damage was caused or contributed to by the intentional misconduct or gross negligence of the person suffering the damage.

As regards damage to other aircraft, the Air Code applies general tort liability principles. Where the degree of fault cannot be determined, the divided damages rule, as in American admiralty, is applied.

9. CARGO AIR TRANSPORTATION

As a general rule the issuance of an air waybill (*gruzovaia nakladnaia*) evidences a cargo air transportation contract between the carrier, on the one hand, and the consignor, on the other.

The Code, therefore, prescribes a penalty for breach of a cargo air transportation agreement. Failure to make available the planned transportation facilities, or failure to present the cargo for reserved air shipment, subjects the carrier and consignor, as the case may be, to a penalty amounting to 25 per cent of the shipping cost of the not shipped or not transported cargo. The consignor, however, is relieved of liability for nondelivery of cargo for shipment or for delivery of a lesser quantity thereof, where such was the result of an event of elemental character, or any other event of such nature as to produce work stoppage for a period of not less than 72 hours. The carrier, too, is under like circumstances, relieved of liability for not making available transportation facilities; and this includes inability of the aircraft ot fly for meteorological reasons.

Besides liability incurred for nonshipment of cargo after reservation of space, a consignor may be liable for damage resulting from incorrectnes, inaccuracy, or incomplete information, supplied by him when preparing the air waybill which accompanies the cargo on its entire route.

A cargo air carrier is, of course, liable for the cargo entrusted to him, except where the loss or diminution thereof was unavoidable or beyond its means to prevent it, or due to the consignor's action or inaction, or to natural causes. The extent of the air carrier's liability is precisely circumscribed by the statute, which also covers damages for delay in the cargo delivery. Conversely, consignors and consignees are held accountable for any damage caused by them directly to the cargo air carrier, as well as to others whom the carrier is obligated to compensate therefor.

10. CONCLUSION

This author, upon analysis of the state of progress of the Soviet aviation industry, and of the laws which govern it, has come to the conclusion that from the American point of view it is not desirable that the dormant United States-USSR bilateral aviation agreement be made effective. Neither is there really any need therefor.

Comparatively few Americans are travelling to the Soviet Union. Their insignificant number provides no incentive for an American air carrier, short of a sizeable United States Government subsidy, to undertake the arduous tasks of flying a non-productive route, and under operational conditions and rules which are deliberately kept enigmatic by the Soviet authorities. It follows, that making effective the United States-USSR bilateral agreement would be tantamount to payment by the American taxpayer for another Russian propaganda success, for enhancement of Soviet prestige in Communist and newly emerged nations and, thus, for another Soviet diplomatic victory.

As regards the Soviet average citizen as a potential customer, he is not going to the United States nor, for that matter, anywhere else, and will not be going for a long time. The American traveller, on the other hand, tempted to chance the hazards of travel to or within the Soviet Union on Aeroflot, must know that to do so is to subject himself to laws which provide little comfort and show little concern for those to whom they apply.

One more thought: the Russians do not release reports of their aircraft accidents, nor do they publish the names of the passengers involved therein.

Remarks of the President at the Swearing-In Ceremony for Barnaby Keeney as Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in the 88th Congress I introduced legislation to establish a National Foundation to promote progress in the arts and the humanities.

This idea became a reality in the 89th Congress when the bill to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities was passed by the Congress and signed by the President.

Today, Dr. Barnaby Keeney, former president of Brown University, was sworn in as Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities in an impressive ceremony at the White House.

For the benefit of all of my colleagues, but especially for those who cosponsored the legislation, I insert the eloquent remarks of President Johnson on this occasion.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE SWEARING-IN CEREMONY FOR BARNABY KEENEY AS CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Carl Sandburg, our great poet and good friend, speaks in one of his poems of our endless search for things beyond mere wealth. Americans, he writes, always come—

> "To the time for thinking things over;
> To the dance, the song, the story—
> Or the hours given over to dreaming."

Today we gather not only to honor Barnaby Keeney as he begins a new chapter in his distinguished career. We are here to help our best minds find "the time for thinking things over"; to encourage our singers and story-tellers; to assist our scholars and thinkers whose hours of dreaming assure our years of greatness.

It has been less than a year since I signed legislation establishing the National Endowment for the Humanities—only a few months since the members of the Humanities Council took their oath in this room.

But in a short time, they have raised large hopes. Under the wise and spirited leadership of Dr. Henry Allen Moe, the Council has underwritten 200 summer fellowships for young scholars and teachers; 50 grants to established scholars in the humanities; awards totaling $300,000 to museums and historical societies for their education projects.

The council's grants are making our American classics more widely available; assisting historical researchers; distributing recorded classics to the blind; and improving the quality of educational television and radio.

The new chairman of the Council and the Endowment, Dr. Keeney, is a product of a great public university—the University of North Carolina—and a great private one, Harvard. He served in World War II and has distinguished himself as a professor of history, dean, and president of Brown University.

But I know he agrees that his new responsibilities will be the most demanding of his career.

For Dr. Keeney and the Council will be dealing with far deeper questions than how to distribute dollars. They will be probing deep into the heart of our people and our society for answers to the ancient mysteries: What meaning has life? What purpose has man?

That is the veil mankind has always sought to part; it is the mystery that has challenged and shaped us as a Nation from the first.

Our first soldiers and politicians were also our first scholars and philospohers. The Nation they brought forth excited all men—because it promised answers to the ancient mysteries, new meaning and fulfillment for man.

Ours was the only Nation ever based on an idea—that all men are created equal—that every man is entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

But today, we still ponder the questions of the meaning of life and the purpose of man.

We know the answers are not wealth, or weapons, or wise government. These can help make life possible—but they can never make it meaningful.

So we turn for our answers to those whose profession is ideas; our scholars and writers, our historians and philosophers; our men and women, boys and girls of the Arts and Humanities.

They have contributed as much to our national life as our soldiers and politicians. They have lighted our path for almost two centuries—and the centuries ahead ask even more of their mind and heart.

That is why I have such great hopes for the Humanities Council—greater, perhaps, than the Endowment's budget—but I know that small budgets can spur large imagination.

And if the council has only a small membership and staff, I know that small budgets can spur large imagination.

And if the council has only a small membership and staff, I know that accomplishment does not depend on size.

I think of the Council as a small spark which can give the Nation—and the world—great light.

All of us, Carl Sandburg has written, are reaching out "for lights beyond . . . for keepsakes lasting beyond any hunger or death."

These keepsakes are not the products of industry, or spoils of war, or luxuries of wealth. They are the old ideas, the old words. The older they are, the more their meaning excites all men.

Freedom is one of them. Truth is another.

How well we preserve these priceless keepsakes, Dr. Keeney will depend a great deal on the work which you and your colleagues do.

So I wish you well. I welcome you—and I am happy to be your witness as you take the oath of office.

Thank you.

Indianapolis Hard Hit by Airline Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the strike against five major airlines is now in its seventh day.

It would be a serious mistake, in my opinion, to underestimate the economic consequences which could result from a prolonged strike.

The situation in Indianapolis, a major industrial center of Indiana and the Midwest, already is grave.

This fact has been explained in telegrams which have been sent to President Johnson from the mayor of Indianapolis and the president of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce.

I insert the text of these two telegrams to be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Indianapolis and Indiana is suffering economic loss at the inconvenience and traffic delay occasioned by the present airline strike. I urge that all resources available to the Office of the President be used to settle this dispute as equitably and expeditiously as possible.

JOHN J. BARTON,
Mayor of Indianapolis.

JULY 8, 1966.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D.C.:

The current strike agaist major airlines has a serious effect on the economy of our city. Being one of the Nation's significant industrial centers, it is in the national and public interest to use your good office to bring about an early equitable settlement.

Respectfully yours,

ROY C. ECHOLS,
President, Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce.

SBA Assists Doctor's Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the outlook is often dark for rural residents when it comes to seeking many of the services and conveniences urban residents take for granted. The prospects for medical services were especially dark in northwest Limestone County, Ala., when the State health department announced its Lester Clinic would be closed.

The darkness now has been broken. The long time dream of Dr. David Eldridge Jackson of Lester to establish a rural hospital in his community will come true through the assistance provided by the Small Business Administration. Paul R. Brunson, regional director of SBA for the State of Alabama, worked with Dr. Jackson and the people of Lester to insure the medical needs of the citizens will be met close to home.

The Huntsville, Ala., Times has pointed to this achievement as a "good example of what community enterprises and the Small Business Administration cooperation can do toward saving and expanding the Nation's villages and small towns." As part of my remarks, I include the entire editorial:

A COMMUNITY DISCOVERS SBA

Lester, Ala., lies in the steep hills and shallow farmlands of northwest Limestone

County, and it is there that Dr. David Eldridge Jackson planted a dream a quarter-century ago.

It was the dream of a young man who as a medical student, wished to come back to the hamlet he had known as a boy and to establish there a rural hospital. And since 1940 his small hospital has strived to handle a share of the Lester community's problem of the ailing.

When the State Health Department announced that its Lester clinic would be closed, it was apparent that Dr. Jackson's own medical facilities for the community—isolated by distance from Lawrenceburg and Pulaski, Tenn., and Athens, Ala.—would be alarmingly over-taxed.

But now the Farmers Bank in Anderson in cooperation with the Small Business Administration has approved a loan of $200,000 to Dr. Jackson. It will enable him to erect a new 22-bed hospital with outpatient departments and complete facilities for two doctors. Surgical departments, emergency rooms, labor and delivery rooms and up-to-date diagnostical equipment are in the plans.

Indicative of the needs of the community are the figures which show that Dr. Jackson in his present hospital admitted 607 patients and treated 3,300 outpatients last year. The SBA loan for a new hospital has been made under the loan guaranty plan, with the SBA guaranteeing a portion of the bank loan.

Recognizing that the facilities provided by this type loan will alleviate much suffering and care for many medical needs of the Lester community suggests that there are many other communities in Alabama with problems akin to those of Lester. SBA assistance could be an answer. In fact, SBA assistance can be, and is proving to be, of vast assistance to communities in many areas and in many fields of enterprise.

Lester itself, for instance, already has seen other possibilities for community development with SBA aid. A broad-based group of interested citizens now plans SBA financing to bring industry into the community to provide jobs for its homefolks—a people in a region where crop failures often have meant near-disaster. Under such a program, SBA will furnish as much as $8 for every $2 the citizens group provided. And with these funds, land can be purchased, buildings constructed and machinery purchased to operate a small business.

Lester soon may be known as a good example of what community enterprises and Small Business Administration cooperation can do toward saving and expanding a nation's villages and small towns.

Eugene C. Pulliam Receives Honorary Doctor of Laws Degree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished publisher, Eugene C. Pulliam, was recently given an honorary doctor of laws degree from Vincennes University at a dinner in his honor held by the Vincennes, Ind., Historical and Antiquarian Society and the university.

In his remarks at the dinner, Mr. Pulliam spoke on the role of a free press in a free society. He also announced the plans for a new building and equipment for the Vincennes Sun-Commercial.

Mr. Pulliam's closing words to the audience are especially pertinent today when the United States faces grave problems and crises throughout the world:

> If America remains free under the Constitution, then sometime, somehow, someway, America being free will show the rest of the world the road to freedom. . . . This is the divine mission of America—freedom for ourselves and eventually freedom for all the world.

The following story from the Vincennes, Ind., Sun-Commercial, June 30, 1966, deals with the ceremonies and Mr. Pulliam's address.

SUN-COMMERCIAL TO BUILD PLANT

Plans for a new building and equipment for the Vincennes Sun-Commercial were announced Wednesday evening by publisher Eugene C. Pulliam.

The veteran Hoosier publisher made the announcement at a dinner in his honor held by the Vincennes Historical and Antiquarian Society and Vincennes University at the Robert Green Auditorium.

Before the announcement Dr. Isaac K. Beckes presented him with an honorary Doctor of Law degree from Vincennes University, the oldest college in Indiana. Thomas Emison, former president of the Vincennes Historical and Antiquarian Society, presented him with a lifetime membership in the society.

"Vincennes has been good, very good to the Sun-Commercial which has simply outgrown its old coat and pants. It needs a new suit and that's what we are going to give it—a brand new newspaper plant on a new site with a new offset press and all the trimmings," Pulliam said.

The new plant, which is to cost "at least a quarter of a million dollars, maybe more," will contain a display outlining the history of the free press in Vincennes and in the nation, Pulliam explained.

Speaking before some 200 society members and Sun-Commercial employes, Pulliam outlined the role of the free press in the development of a free society.

Especially he noted the role of Elihu Stout, publisher of the Indiana Gazette in Vincennes.

"Abraham Lincoln saw his first newspaper press in this city. He became one of the foremost champions of the right of the people to know what their government is doing and why," Pulliam said.

He pointed out that Governor William Henry Harrison deserves more credit from history than he has received.

"Harrison encouraged the establishment of 'A Press' in the capital of the Indiana Territory."

He reminded the audience that the only business mentioned in the Constitution is the newspaper business.

"The very first of the Bill of Rights says that Congress shall 'make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press'!"

He also referred to the first section of the first article of the first constitution of Indiana, "That the printing presses shall be free to every person, who undertakes to examine the proceedings of the Legislature, or any branch of government; and no law shall ever be made to restrain the right thereof. The free communication of thoughts and opinions, is one of the invaluable rights of man: and every citizen may speak freely, write, and print on any subject, being responsible for the abuse of that liberty."

Pulliam urged that ". . . the simple and direct language of the original Indiana Constitution might be impressed upon every government official, every member of Congress, every judge, every administrator, every bureaucrat, and most of all, every American citizen."

Concluding he reminded the audience that "If America remains free under the Constitution, then sometime, somehow, someway, America being free will show the rest of the world the road to freedom. This is the message and this is the mandate from old Vincennes to the new Vincennes. This is the divine mission of America—freedom for ourselves and eventually freedom for all the world."

Pulliam was accompanied by his wife, Mrs. Nina Pulliam and his son Eugene S. Pulliam, assistant publisher of Indianapolis Newspapers, Inc.

Why a Tax Increase?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following news article by Henry J. Taylor, entitled "Why a Tax Increase?"

WHY A TAX INCREASE?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

No, fellow peasants, it's not enough to have living costs hit us now with the biggest three-months leap in 15 years. The Washington Robin Hoods of the Red Ink ponder a beautiful solution.

What we need, you see, is a tax increase.

The penalty and stupidity of the political world is astounding and proverbial, but this latest affront to the pocketbook and common sense of the American people takes the cake.

We need higher taxes like we need a hole in the head.

We're willing to pay for everything we should pay for, including the Viet Nam War, and the tax take is already colossal. But it's high time we told these electioneers by a revolt at the polls that they can't make patsies out of us forever.

Here we sit, paying for all their blunders in foreign policy, their mixed-up decisions and waste, and they have the gall to say we should pay still more. We will never do with dollars what they fail to do with brains.

Here we sit, paying for their giveaways in 83 countries all over the world in ways that are often so silly that millions don't call us Uncle Sam. They call us Uncle Sap. The harder some country, like Egypt, kicks us in the teeth the more determined our Robin Hoods seem to be to give it more of our taxpayers' money. And at home? Is the war on poverty, for example, a war or is it a political racket?

Here we sit, footing the bill for everything, while the politicians themselves sacrifice nothing. We pay for their gleaming cavalcade of superabundant jets, limousines, junkets and other goodies while their taxes on us are the largest single item in our cost of living.

The over-all buying power of the dollar you work for and save for a rainy day has melted away 15 per cent in the past decade. While you're working for a dollar that's going down you are paying taxes that are going up. And nothing remotely compares with these in your cost of living.

At about $167 billion this year Federal, state and local taxes equal $851 for every man, woman and child in the United States.

The rich do not support these taxes. That's political pap. The rich are too few. About 85 per cent of all families earn less than $10,000 a year; 14 per cent earn $10,000 to $7,500; 26 per cent earn less than $3,000. Only 22 per cent earn more than $10,000 a year.

This column has pointed out previously that the average wage earner must work two hours and 19 minutes every working day of the year just to pay his taxes.

If taxes go up the inflation will go up, and so will the cost of living. The next time anybody disputes this, ask a few simple questions:

If the government spenders add a thousand dollars to your taxes what happens to the money? They just take it from you and spend it themselves. The money supply and the pressure on purchases have not been reduced. The only time taxes are anti-inflationary is when they're used to reduce the government debt or in other ways used to lessen the money supply. Nobody is proposing that. All the talk is about more and more spending.

Under today's conditions, increasing taxes increases today's inflation. When taxes go up, take-home pay goes down. Workers need higher wages to live on what they earn, after taxes. This pressures wages higher as taxes go higher.

Both wages and taxes are factors in the costs of production. Prices go up as taxes and wages go up. Up goes the cost of living.

Politicians try to make us swallow higher taxes by saying they are a help against inflation—an inflation due chiefly to their own mishandling of our money at home and abroad.

Even a criminal is entitled to fair play. And we're not criminals; we're taxpayers. If I had my way, I'd like to see any politician who passes the buck like this run out of town on a rail. Enough is enough of their bloody nonsense.

The Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Peace Corps is providing an enormously valuable service to humanity. It is an idea which has been accepted, not only by all in our Nation, but by nearly all the peoples of the earth.

It has provided experiences to young Americans which will prove to be invaluable to our Nation in the future.

One young American, currently serving with the Peace Corps in Tanzania, Miss Gretta Conlan, like so many of her fellow workers, has been taken to the hearts of the people of her host country. At the recent Ecumenical Council in Rome, one of the leading Cincinnati clergymen attending was sought out by an African bishop who had firsthand knowledge of the work of the Peace Corps, and in particular, of Miss Conlan. The bishop told the pastor of Miss Conlan, Msgr. Edward A. Freking, of St. Mary's Church in Cincinnati, to carry back home the heartfelt thanks of those Africans who were privileged to work with Miss Conlan, and to tell her friends of the deep respect and affection they have for her.

Miss Conlan has often sent to her family and friends in the United States letters which describe her experiences and her feelings for the people of Africa. I have been permitted to read most of her letters, and find them so very well written that I would suggest that the Corps might want to publish them in the future as an example of what it is trying to do in the world.

Several excerpts follow:

[Letter of February 19, 1965]

What makes it all worthwhile are the warm and fun loving people, especially the students. I am impressed by how much people are the same, especially children. They are full of life; love a good time; enjoy a good laugh; love to twist; are interested in all kinds of things and love impressing you with anything new and exciting. There are barriers, but we are growing accustomed to each others' ways and are learning to enjoy things together. The boys will come over in the evening and ask us to tell them about this or that; or to help them with some problem. I just had a session with about six boys this evening who wanted me to explain why God made some people black and some people white. They were very sincere and thought that I could answer the question. They are coming back tomorrow to hear about President Kennedy, in whom all are very interested. They know the whole story of his assassination very well. They speak of him with a great deal of respect.

I must say that getting to know these people beneath the surface has made me reevaluate myself. I did not realize the prejudices I held till I came here and felt so free of prejudice. I have never been so uncolor conscious in my life. Subconsciously I believe I lived as though man's basic desires decreased with lack of opportunity. The facts are blinding me to the contrary.

[Letter of July 29, 1965]

If You Only Knew (the People of Africa)

If you only knew
What gifts they had,
What smiles of warmth
And gladness were brought
To all who pass their way

If you only knew
Their ways of knowing,
Your trials detected—
And their ability
To make things right

If you only knew
What thoughts of others
Filled their hearts
With love and brotherhood

Then no sacrifice could be
So great
So overwhelming
To hinder your passing here
If you only knew.

Poetry is not my line, but sometimes it's the only way of expressing ones feeling, and this is my feeble attempt at describing for you the people of Africa.

Places are the same without people, and this is where my real love for Africa lies—in the people. I want to try and describe some of them for you because this is the real heart of Africa. Let me begin by saying that I feel inadequate to describe in words; because it is only by the day to day intermingling of our lives that we have come to an understanding, appreciation and love for each other. We have experienced one another as humans who share the same needs, the same desires, the same reactions to situations, and the same feelings of love, sadness, joy and laughter. Our different backgrounds of experience and environment are the only things which separate us. Only by living with people can you come to a knowledge of this. I am constantly aware of this privilege that is mine.

Though my skin is white, though I speak with a foreign accent, though the image of the Wazungu (British) is still fresh in their minds, they have accepted me and made me a very welcome member of the Family with whom I stay. Mr. Mgalula is the father of the Family. He is a man with wisdom beyond his years; his sensitivity and goodness I find to be limitless. I'm sorry that these sound like platitudes without meaning. I will try to share some of the experiences with you. Mr. Mgalula is our Headmaster, and was the first person to welcome us at Mwisenge. He had spent weeks helping to make our house ready and comfortable. I shall never forget his comment when I asked what we could do to get the school ready, since it was opening the day after our arrival. He said, "Oh no, what can I do for you? My most important job now is to see that you are happy and welcome in my country."

Experience has shown that these were not idle words. When our United States Ambassador left this country and the Tanzania representative returned from the United States, I felt uneasy. I discussed this uneasiness with Mr. Mgalula. He told me that we were people living together trying to share ideas and help each other; that we could not control the decisions of our governments; and that the relationship of one person to another, or individual people to other individual people, went beyond anything which might tend to separate us. We have often had Mr. Mgalula to our house and we have often visited his. One night he was here and noticed a picture of my mother and father. "Bwana and Bibi Conlan," he said fondly—"they have given us something which I'm sure they miss deeply, as I would miss my own daughter." And then he turned to me and said, "Thank you for coming to help us."

He is very fond of saying, "Americans do things in a big way," and "A friend in need is a friend indeed." He incorporated these two thoughts into a conversation I overheard with the football team. He said that Americans were our friends and that they had the foresight to see the needs in our country. That they had people who were willing to leave the comforts (which he described in detail) of home, family and friends and live with people who were not so fortunate. He told the boys never to forget that the Americans had come themselves and had not sent "representatives" as had some other countries which he named.

Should Rich Kids Get Handouts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are concerned about the future of our country and the quality of leadership in the generations ahead. Every Member of this body is also vitally interested in providing excellence in education for today's youth. However, the approach to this worthwhile objective differs. Some of us voted against the Elementary and Secondary Education Act last year for a variety of reasons. The administration pleaded for the legislation on the basis of its strengthening education for children whose parents were living in conditions of poverty as defined by the Federal Government.

In the House debate surrounding this measure some of us tried to pinpoint the shortcomings of the bill by showing that children not in need of financial assistance, even youngsters from wealthy homes, could benefit from the grant. We were reassured this was not the case and only children of impoverished families would be eligible for assistance. This has not been the experience of the program.

An excellent exposé on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 appears in the July edition of Nations Business and I have unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

Should Rich Kids Get Handouts?

The much-heralded, billion-dollar package of federal aid for elementary and secondary education, enacted last year after decades of struggle, is getting poor marks in many parts of the country.

Although many projects under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 are just now getting started, already there are these disturbing developments:

To a significant extent, the stated purpose of the act's costliest provision—to expand and improve educational programs in areas where there are concentrations of poor children—is being abused.

Money is being urged on communities that don't want it.

The poorest states are getting the least amount of money per school child.

There's an alarming lack of personnel to carry out the new law.

Some school districts are spending frantically to use up a full year's allotment in just a couple of months.

ABUSES NO SURPRISE

These developments come as no surprise to such lawmakers as Rep. Edith Green (D., Oregon), Rep. Charles Goodell (R., N.Y.) and Rep. Albert Quie (R., Minn.). They, along with business and other groups, warned of these failings.

Even more disturbing to some people, both in and out of government, is what's ahead. At a time when many are urging a cutback in nondefense expenditures, this law is almost certain to be expanded.

President Johnson regards the school Act as one of his proudest accomplishments. Signing the bill on Palm Sunday last year at the one-room schoolhouse he attended as a boy in Stonewall, Texas, the President enthused: "I believe deeply no law I have signed or will ever sign means more to the future of America."

Its meaning is becoming more cloudy as various weaknesses appear.

The major thrust of the Act is Title I. Under this more than $1 billion can be spent through this summer for 22,000 projects in all 50 states and the territories.

Title I's stated aim is to help broaden and strengthen education for children in poverty. It seeks to do this through grants, for both public and private school children, to pay for such programs as remedial instruction, guidance and counseling services and health and welfare services. Money can also be used to acquire equipment and, in a few cases, build facilities.

When the bill was debated in Congress a year ago this spring, an outvoted minority argued that the poverty label was phony. Rep. Goodell called the legislation "a thinly veiled attempt to launch a general federal aid to education program by means of a spurious appeal to purposes which it would not adequately serve."

One of the measure's backers, Rep. Robert Stafford Republican, of Vermont, admitted as much: "This is the only general aid to education bill presented over these many years with a real chance of passage by the House of Representatives."

Former Rep. Robert Griffin Republican, of Michigan, took this view: "Some may vote for this bill because they think it will cure poverty. Others may vote for it, not as poverty legislation, but as a general aid to education bill. It ought to be one or the other but, unfortunately, it is a poor bill for either purpose." Mr. Griffin is now a Senator.

The poverty criterion was written into the bill mainly to enhance its chances of overcoming years-old resistance to helping finance nonpublic and parochial schools.

How, then, is the measure working?

Take Garden City, N.Y., a charming town of about 25,000 population 19 miles east of New York City. Hardly a center of destitution, median family income there is about $14,000 and median value of the homes along the village's quiet, tree-lined streets is about $30,000. Within its five square miles are about 7,000 dwelling units, three golf courses, Adelphi University and a stately resort hotel.

Though it doesn't expect to spend all of its allocation, Garden City can get $33,551 of Education Act money because of its "poor" children. But well-to-do Garden City's supposed poor children apparently exist only as statistics. School officials can find no children in poverty.

The Act tells states to use 1960 census figures and the most recent welfare figures they have in determining how much federal money each school district in the state should get.

In New York, as in other states, education official have had difficulty relating census tract figures to their 997 school districts.

Richard Schilling, a planning supervisor for the state Department of Education, tells Nation's Business that in many cases you can't pinpoint the poor by school districts. "Most of the money is going to areas needing it, but there are inequities."

Garden City School Superintendent Oliver Melchior says he was surprised when the state notified him that its sampling showed his district had 91.76 economically deprived youngsters and thus was entitled to the $33,551. Mr. Melchior scoured the village for these "poor" children, but he couldn't find one or even .76 of one. Still, the state told him that if his district didn't use the money, no other could. Garden City submitted a project, got it approved and is spending about a third of its entitlement to give slow-learning children more individual help.

Aid is supposed to be restricted to areas "with high concentrations of children from low-income families," Office of Education regulations say. And such proponents of the bill as Rep. Roman Pucinski, Democrat, of Illinois, reassured in last year's House debate: "I wish to emphasize that no community can get any assistance under Title I unless it has children of impoverished families." But once an area qualifies, the money can be spent on any "educationally deprived" kids in the district, even the children of rich parents.

Education Office sources told Nation's Business in one breath that "Garden City has a damn good program dealing with the problems we want dealt with," and in another that the village probably won't get any money next year. One bureaucrat described Garden City—in a phrase that might apply to other seeming misfits under the Act—as a "small price to pay for getting the over-all aid program off the ground."

Now jump across the country to Beverly Hills, Calif., for a more self-reliant approach to federal school aid. Using 1960 census data, the California Department of Education determined the Beverly Hills Unified School District was entitled to $82,875. That data showed 460 local families reporting annual income of less than $2,000. On investigation, the district could find only six families, with eight children in school, who qualified.

"We looked at these children and found they are neither educationally deprived nor handicapped. They already are in small classes and have remedial help available, if they need it," says Superintendent Kenneth L. Peters. "Our board decided against applying for the funds. We aren't opposed to federal aid, but after reading and rereading the law, we think it would be difficult to justify a wealthy district participating in this program. We should not become involved in inventing crash programs just to qualify for federal money."

THEM AS HAS TAKES

Ironically, the wealthiest county in the nation, Montgomery County, Md., is a major recipient of elementary and secondary aid. Though the 1960 census gave it a median family income of $9,317, it's eligible for $557,000. Says William Feddeman, director of the county's Department for the Planning and Development of Federal and State Programs, "We feel a responsibility to spend it." Most of the money is going to 10 "target" schools for remedial reading, psychological services and health and physical education.

But nearly $18,000 of federal money from another part of the Act will help send aspiring young musicians to a summer music camp in the woods of western Maryland.

Youngsters are auditioned, not chosen on the basis of poverty. So taxes collected from rich and poor alike will be spent on musically inclined youngsters of the wealthiest county in the U.S.A.

New York City is getting $65 million under Title I of the Act—more money than any other city. Yet the president of the Board of Education told a city hall budget hearing that "the New York City public schools surpass in quality and in their forward momentum those of any other city in America."

In contrast not a dime is going into one-room school houses in some impoverished Kentucky areas and in other border and southern states where there are concentrations of the poor. The U.S. Office of Education says this is on purpose, that it is trying to do away with the inefficient, outdated, one-room structures. This may well be a beneficial long-range goal, but critics point out that until more modern school facilities are available, the children in some of these ramshackle schools get the short end of the hickory stick. And, as Congresswoman Green points out, the Education Act contains no provision for closing any kinds of schools.

Major blame for what many regard as a misdirection of funds can be placed on the Act's requirement that 1960 census figures be used to determine where the poor are. These figures, the latest census data available, actually were gathered in 1959, seven years ago. So they don't show any movement of population since then or any increase in people's income during recent boom years.

Some blame has to be laid at the feet of Education Act administrators who tell questioning local school superintendents not to worry how allocations are arrived at.

Under another section of the Education Act, Title V, Congress appropriated $17 million to strengthen state departments of education. New York and California, states which an education office spokesman said already have the strongest departments in the country, get the most aid.

FORCING FUNDS ON THEM

Some local school officials whose districts don't want education aid money complain they are being harassed by bureaucrats.

Santa Ana (Calif.) Unified School District learned of its $423,222 entitlement not from state authorities but by reading about it in a Los Angeles newspaper. Despite pressures that built up within the district between the time of the news article and the time the district was notified by the state that the story was accurate, Santa Ana school trustees rejected the money.

Burbank (Calif.) Unified School District also learned of the $247,869 available to it from reading a newspaper account. "I was astonished by the amount," Superintendent Richard Clause recalls. Burbank didn't apply for the money. "We are a moderately wealthy district with no clear pockets of poverty. Our school board feels we're able to pay our own way."

Oxnard Union High School District, about 40 miles northwest of Los Angeles, rejected its $77,064 entitlement. Superintendent Joseph W. Crosby explains, "We believe local taxpayers should handle our education cost. If we were taxed to the hilt, I don't think we'd refuse federal help. But we aren't and we feel it's more economical to do the job ourselves. We've set up, on our own over the years, a curriculum for the extremely bright youngsters.

We have remedial classes, classes for non-English-speaking children, classes for the mentally retarded and the severely mentally retarded and speech therapy. The school board has never refused me a program that meets a genuine need."

California school districts entitled to about $5 million have replied: "Thanks, but no thanks."

Critics of the Act point out that one of its most unfair features is that the poorest states will get the least amount of money per disadvantaged child. By keying the amount of aid a locality can get to the state's average per pupil expenditure, more affluent states that spend more per child because they have more tax dollars to spend, get more federal doles than the poorer ones. "The rich get richer and the poor get poorer," says New York's Rep. Goodell.

Reps. Green and Quie, among others, have maintained that if the intent of the Act is, indeed, to help children of the poor, the formula doesn't work. Since the bill became law, it has also been found that localities which might best use more money either aren't getting it or have to wait far back in line because they can't afford to hire a special staff properly to draft their applications. Well-heeled school systems, such as Maryland's Montgomery County, have a staff of experts to do the paperwork.

School officials are discovering that it's one thing to formulate a project but quite another to find qualified personnel to carry it out. A blue-ribbon panel picked by President Johnson to evaluate the operation of Title I of the school law recently issued its first annual report. It found "in virtually every area studied, there is an alarming lack of personnel, particularly in specialized skills."

A manpower survey should have been taken before committing the billion of tax dollars, Mrs. Green says. Rep. Goodell notes the intense competition, even with the federal government, for the teachers and specialists the Act seeks. "In my state, we lose some of these already scarce people to higher-paying, antipoverty jobs in the Office of Economic Opportunity."

First-year spending under the Education Act was supposed to end June 30. But districts have been allowed to extend their spending through the summer. Some are even trying to spend a whole years' allotment in just a couple of months. Glendale (Calif.) Unified School District, for example, was late in getting its project in and approved, but now it hopes to spend its entire $315,584 entitlement for a summer reading clinic. Altogether, the Office of Education estimates, $300 million will be spent this summer for 3.5 million children to attend summer school projects.

In its report, the Presidential panel says, "It is too early to obtain evidence about the results of any of the programs, but it is abundantly clear the evaluation will be difficult." While commending officials and educators for launching the program in such short time, the group is concerned that, among other things, there's no system of quality control, that coordination is in some cases lacking between Education Act projects and those sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity and that nonpublic school pupils don't seem to be getting their share.

One community, Anaheim, Calif., is especially sympathetic toward the financial burdens the federal government now carries. So sympathetic, in fact, that the Anaheim City Council has adopted resolution 66R-247, which reads:

"Resolution of the City Council of the City of Anaheim tendering a grant-in-aid to the Great White Father.

"Whereas the Great White Father in Washington has spread his omniscient munificence to enfold the fiscal welfare of his American municipalities, and

"Whereas this benevolent munificence is manifested by a tender of untold millions in grants-in-aid for water, sewers, urban redevelopment, poverty, public works, housing and a multitude of other fields in which Great Father opines his children are unequal to the task; and

"Whereas Great Father nevertheless has informed the children that there will be necessary a great raise in taxation; and

"Whereas the city of Anaheim has compared its fiscal condition with that of the Great Father and found that the city is in far better financial condition, and that Great Father is in great need of a grant-in-aid for himself: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the city of Anaheim does hereby tender to Great Father, the sum of $100 as a grant-in-aid (with no strings attached) to be used for whatever national purpose may be in greatest need thereof."

The Fair Housing Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the time when we may be called to vote on the crucial issue of the 1966 civil rights bill. I must state that I find title IV of that bill destructive of the right of private property ownership. Furthermore, title IV is calculated to palce the homeowner in a position where he must defend his rights against any frivolous complaint, a position that could lead to his financial distress. Conceivably, any disappointed person whose offer to buy or lease was not accepted could take the owner to court, have his case paid for by the Government, and watch the legal apparatus of the Department of Justice go to work on the hapless homeowner.

I have recently read an editorial in the Washington Daily News of June 15, 1966 entitled "The Fair Housing Debate," in which testimony by Mr. Dennis M. Lynch is briefly discussed. Mr. Lynch, who is president of the Real Estate Association of Rhode Island, advocates that local programs handle the problem of fair housing, for as he says the Rhode Island fair housing law is ineffective, and a Federal housing law could do no more. I agree with Mr. Lynch and feel that title IV would serve only to destroy the basic rights of the property owners.

I, therefore, include this editorial in the Record:

THE FAIR HOUSING DEBATE

Real estate spokesmen, who know the field best, are marshaling some powerful arguments against the fair housing section of the Administration's civil rights bill now under study in Congress.

They do not quarrel with its goal—free and equal access to housing for every individual, regardless of race, color or creed. Nor would most Americans. But they do contend that trying to achieve this goal thru Federal law will do more harm than good to all concerned. Most worrisome is their argument that the law could be used to harass innocent homeowners.

Alan L. Emlen, spokesman for a Washington committee of the National Association of Read Estate Boards, said even "frivolous" complaints alleging discrimination could keep an owner's home off the market as long as several years pending court action. And even if the home owner finally were found innocent of any discrimination the long process "could wipe out (his) equity in his home."

America is an increasingly mobile society. Many are required by their jobs to sell their homes and use the proceeds to buy homes elsewhere. Which would make any such harassment doubly punitive.

Other real estate witnesses have voiced like fears and have warned such a Federal law would discourage real estate investment. They may be overstating their case somewhat. But in raising the red flag against sacrificing an innocent home-owner's property rights in an effort to end housing discrimination they have made a positive contribution to the debate.

The only abiding answer to the problem was proposed by Dennis M. Lynch, president of the real estate association in Rhode Island, which has a fair housing law Lynch said was ineffective. He proposed local, voluntary programs to help people find homes in areas they choose, to build neighborhood acceptance of minority families and to encourage formation of non-profit housing corporations.

It has been, of course, the absence of just such efforts over the years that finally gave rise to the Federal fair housing proposals—which Congress may decide create more problems than they solve. But even if approved, they won't do the constructive job Mr. Lynch correctly says must be done.

Concurrent Resolution Adopted by the 1966 Keystone Boys State General Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the following concurrent resolution adopted by the 1966 Keystone Boys State General Assembly, which was held at University Park, Pa., June 20 through 28, and which expresses the support of the President's policy and our men in Vietnam.

The petition accompanying this resolution, which was sent to the President, contained 372 signatures:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION: SERIAL NO. 3—IN THE SENATE, JUNE 28, 1966

(Expressing the support of the 1966 Keystone Boys State General Assembly of the President's policy and our men in Vietnam)

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States are currently engaged in combat with the Viet Cong forces in South Vietnam in response to a request for aid from the government of South Vietnam and in protest of the violation of the treaty agreements by the government of North Vietnam; and

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States are seeking to combat the hardships and cruelties inflicted upon the helpless people of South Vietnam by the communist supported Viet Cong; and

Whereas our action is in keeping with our National policy both from the standpoint of self-interest and from the standpoint of helping those people in the world who are unable to help themselves against aggressors; and

Whereas there are citizens in the United States who are openly criticizing and either knowingly or unwittingly attempting to undermine this National policy of the United States government and are thereby giving aid and comfort to the enemy; therefore be it

Resolved (*the House of Representatives concurring*), That the General Assembly of Keystone Boys State hereby expresses its wholehearted support of the men in the Armed Forces of the United States in their loyal and courageous stand against evil communist forces in keeping with the historic tradition of the men of Pennsylvania in every conflict in which our country has been engaged; and, as representatives of the citizens of Keystone Boys State, the General Assembly deplores the aid and comfort rendered the enemy by the public utterances and demonstrations of persons who seek to weaken the stand of our government; and the General Assembly by this resolution hereby extend to the men of the Armed Forces in South Vietnam its admiration and appreciation of their courage and dedication to duty and by this resolution reaffirms its faith in our Country, support of the President's Policy, and faith in those who are so loyally defending its honor and integrity; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution and a petition with the signatures of the citizens of the 1966 Keystone Boys State be sent to the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Adopted by the Senate, June 28, 1966.
Adopted by the House, June 28, 1966.

SAMUEL T. COOPER,
Governor, Keystone Boys State.
JOSEPH P. GAVENONIS,
Director, Keystone Boys State.

Captive Nations Week 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, in his captive nations proclamation for 1966, has set aside July 17 to 23 for the eighth annual observance of this event.

It is a privilege for me to participate in the commemoration of Captive Nations Week for it is our responsibility in the free world to give hope and support to those captive nations which aspire to national independence. By so doing, we insure the preservation of freedom in the United States and reaffirm our dedication to the noble principles of liberty and self-government on which our country was founded.

We deceive ourselves and threaten the existence of our own liberty when we remain apathetic as each year the list of captive nations increases, and more and more people fall under the yoke of Soviet domination. The list of captive nations to date includes the following:

Country and year of Communist domination

	Year
Armenia	1920
Azerbaijan	1920
Byelorussia	1920
Cossackia	1920
Georgia	1920
Idel-Ural	1920
North Caucasia	1920
Democratic Republic of Far East (Siberyaks)	1920
Ukraine	1920
Turkestan	1922
Estonia	1940
Latvia	1940
Lithuania	1940
Albania	1946
Bulgaria	1946
Outer Mongolia	1946
Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, etc, in Yugoslavia	1946
Poland	1947
Rumania	1947
Czechoslovakia	1948
North Korea	1948
Hungary	1949
East Germany	1949
Mainland China	1949
Tibet	1951
North Vietnam	1954
Cuba	1960

Only our own vigilance and renewed dedication to the cause of freedom will prevent this list from growing longer. And only our own willingness to throw aside our complacency and to bend every effort in the cause of human liberty will shorten the list.

The Soviet Union is maintaining the last remaining enclave of political slavery in our world for today it contains over 119 million non-Russian captives. So long as others are enslaved, our own freedom is insecure. In the interests of a peaceful world order based on universal justice, the right of self-determination must be insured to all peoples.

Dozens of measures have been introduced in this Congress calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. I urge my colleagues to give their support to this legislation, for its early enactment would be a positive step forward in the heroic, sometimes silent, but never-ceasing struggle for freedom being carried on in all parts of the world.

My own city of Chicago last year was honored by the National Committee on Captive Nations which recognized it as the city carrying on the most active captive nations program in the Nation.

Once again, under the inspired and vigorous leadership of Mayor Richard J. Daley, Chicago is commemorating Captive Nations Week. Mayor Daley has issued a proclamation marking the event and has named a Captive Nations Day Committee to coordinate the programs which will be held.

Captive Nations Day will be celebrated in Chicago on July 16 with a parade on State Street beginning at 12 noon followed by an assembly at Grant Park in which all the national groups of our city tracing their ancestry to the captive nations will participate.

It is my pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mayor Daley's proclamation on Captive Nations Day, which follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Crotia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the City of Chicago is linked to these captive nations through the bonds of family, since numbered among the people of Chicago are hundreds of thousands of our citizens who through nativity or ancestry treasure the heritage which endowed them with the culture and industry which are theirs; and

Whereas, these nations have been made captive by the imperialistic, aggressive and heartless policies of communism; and

Whereas, the peoples of these communist-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas, it is appropriate and proper to demonstrate to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the people of the City of Chicago for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas, the people of Chicago, as do all the people of the United States, want for the peoples of the world the same freedom and justice which is theirs:

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby designate the week beginning July 16, 1966 as Captive Nations Week.

I urge the people of Chicago to join in the programs arranged for observance of the occassion, and I urge all of our churches, our educational institutions and all media of communication to observe the plight of the communist-dominated nations and to join in support of the just aspirations of the people of the captive nations.

I especially encourage everyone to concretely demonstrate his or her interest in the people imprisoned in the captive nations by their attendance at or participation in the parade to be held on State Street on Saturday afternoon, July 16 at 12:00 P.M. and at the assembly following in Grant Park.

Dated this 5th day of July, A.D., 1966.

RICHARD J. DALEY, *Mayor*.

The Tunnel's End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial by Mr. Joseph Alsop entitled "The Tunnel's End," which appeared in the Washington, D.C., Post, on Monday, June 27, 1966.

This editorial serves as a remainder to us that, if this Nation continues to proceed with the courage, diligence, persistence, and vigor that are needed to see the unfortunate matter in South Vietnam through, we will reach a new era of peace which the United States and the world generally desire and for which our brave young men are fighting in Vietnam.

The editorial follows:

MATTER OF FACT: THE TUNNEL'S END

(By Joseph Alsop)

At least three times since March, President Johnson has been on the verge of intensifying the bombing pressure on North Vietnam by authorizing such new departures as systematic attacks on the vital oil fuel stores and power stations.

Now, it seems probable, the necessary order will at length be given. This is in fact a very modest step for the President to take, in view of the progressive northern take-over of all aspects of the war in South Vietnam. Flagrant, massive and continuing invasion of one country by another usually leads to a riposte far more grave than anything the President is considering.

But the real cause for rejoicing is not the probable imminence of the President's decision to accept the oft-repeated advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The real cause is the reason for the President's decision, which is the restoration of relative political stability in South Vietnam.

On all three earlier occasions, in brief, the needed presidential order to intensify the bombing was aborted at the last moment by renewed outbreaks of political instability in South Vietnam. These last months have been a hard passage for the astute South Vietnamese Premier, General Nguyen Cao Ky.

Among the opponents of the President's policy, denouncing "the puppet Ky" is currently the fashion. In fact, however, General Ky has shown real independence, quite often defying or ignoring advice from the backseat drivers here in Washington. He also has shown real adroitness as well as genuine moderation in his handling of the political Buddhists and he has succeeded very well.

One has to add the very famous remark of Napoleon's old mother: "Pourvu Que ca Dure"—if only the success lasts! But for the moment, the political outlook in the South has vastly improved. And with luck the outlook should improve further, with the oncoming national election.

In itself, this is a fact of cardinal importance. For the intelligence is crystal clear that the war planners in Hanoi are placing their main hopes for victory on political disorder in South Vietnam and/or mounting opposition to President Johnson here at home.

The disappointment of these hopes must be a grave blow to Hanoi. The blow comes at a bad time, too, for the actual fighting in the south has been going far worse for the Hanoi war planners than most people in this country even begin to suspect.

Behind the confusing pattern of many big and little engagements, two facts stand out. On the one hand, throughout this winter and spring, the Hanoi war planners doubled the scale of their invasion of the South, greatly intensified their efforts in many other ways, and dangerously increased the strain on the Vietcong infrastructure in the South Vietnamese countryside.

The purpose, beyond doubt, was to assume the offensive on a considerable scale, with far-reaching political-military results. Thus far, however—and here is the second key fact—the Communist forces in the South have everywhere failed to regain the initiative.

With extreme brilliance, General Westmoreland has instead kept the enemy continuously off balance by a remarkable series of spoiling operations. These operations have not only left the Hanoi war planners in the wretched situation of a man making huge investments and getting no return at all. In addition, they also have taken a very severe toll on the manpower and morale of the enemy forces.

Furthermore, General Westmoreland has achieved these very impressive results with a margin of strength that is still inadequate. But his margin is widening month by month. Add that the supposedly Buddhist-controlled Vietnamese 1st division has just inflicted a severe defeat on the V.C. in Quangtri Province—which must mean that the recent disorders have affected the Vietnamese army much less than might have been feared.

With the South Vietnamese forces relatively unimpaired, and with his own margin continuously widening, it is obvious that General Westmoreland is soon going to be able to do all sorts of things which his limited resources have not previously permitted.

These new departures, such as virtually permanent occupation of some of the key V.C. base areas, will bring much bigger dividends than can be got with spoiling operations.

Greater pressure on North Vietnam; still worst reverses for the V.C. and North Vietnamese troops in the South; the disappointment of Hanoi's most fondly cherished political hopes—that triple combination, if it can be realized, should produce another turning point in the war.

We were on the brink of catastrophic defeat last year. We are now gaining slowly on the other side. If the turning point comes by autumn, it may even be possible to see light at the end of the tunnel.

Insight Into the Role of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, an unusually vivid insight into the role and nature of the Federal Government is provided by a recent editorial in the Huntsville, Ala., Times. The comments originally were printed in the Tupelo, Miss., Journal before being reprinted in Huntsville.

Because false and misleading information is so prevelant, it is easy to loose sight of the real importance of govenment in the life of the Nation. This editorial points out that to the extent that the dog wags the tail, rather than vice versa, private enterprise is Government.

I am certain my colleagues will be interested in views of this editorial and I ask that it be included at this point in the RECORD:

THE DOG WAGS THE TAIL

Government is everybody's whipping-boy. Many of us with a house with a 50-foot frontage and a checking-account that frequently won't check feel nevertheless capable and authorized to declaim about the costs and wastes of government.

The Times is aware that true understanding of the role of the federal government is met with rarely. Too frequently, virtually all of us declaim when we might better be reflecting. A short time ago, *the Tupelo* (Miss.) *Journal* published an editorial which counters that trend. In fact, it provided such a rare clarity and examples that The Times feels it is both proper and incumbent upon us to provide space to reprint it herein full:

Years ago when we were in school, it was assumed that we had pretty well described the U.S. government if we could rattle off the names of the cabinet members along with those of the President and vice president.

And there are still many who assume that if a few more names are added—such as those who head the Federal Communications Commission of the Interstate Commerce Commission—the American government has been fairly well covered.

But today the sector of private enterprise which draws its living from Uncle Sam is far bigger than the federal government itself.

Thus when we talk about reducing or expanding government expenditures, we automatically imply major changes in private enterprise.

For to the extent that the dog wags the tail, rather than vice versa, private enterprise is government.

That, of course, sounds confusing. And this whole subject is mentioned only because so many people—including boosters of big business—seem to like to condemn "the government" while assuming that business is something wholly apart from and above association with the "federal bureaucracy."

Yet here are a few simple facts which indicate how inadequate the old-time knowledge of cabinet names and duties is in providing an understanding of what the federal government actually is.

Government payments each year to the North American Aviation Company for example, are larger than the sums required to operate the State Department, the Justice Department and the Commerce Department combined.

Yet nobody ever thinks of this two billion dollar outlay to a single private firm as being a part of government—or government costs being affected by the efficiency or wages of this plane manufacturer.

Similarly, the federal government each year pays to a single private firm, the Lockheed Aircraft Company, as much as the nation's entire price support and subsidy program for all the farmers in America has averaged over the last 10 or 12 years.

And the Boeing Aircraft Company draws as much from the federal budget each year as is required to operate the entire U.S. Commerce Department with is scores of programs affecting every aspect of private and business life.

Is the opeartion of Congress, the legislative branch of American government, getting out of hand with its higher salaries, costly investigations, global travel, etc.?

Sometimes all of us probably get to wondering if this isn't so.

But Congress, through one of the three basic branches of American government, actually costs no more than Uncle Sam spends each year on projects conducted by the California Institute of Technology.

And remember all those important agencies of yester-year which were considered so important in government—the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Tariff Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Civil Service Commission?

Today all six of these key independent agencies are administered for less than what the federal government pays each year to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for research work and similar projects.

And while the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency have a payroll themselves of only 40,000 people more than 500,000 people employed by private firms owe their jobs to the contracts their companies have with these two federal agencies.

When we say that government costs too much, that government is wasteful, etc., we mean in a way, therefore, that all these private firms which do work for the government are wasteful in the manner they run their business and in the wages they pay their eight million employes.

As a matter of fact they may be. For a number of large American firms pay their presidents two to four times as much as the President of the United States makes.

And a few private firms even pay their top man as much as is earned by the President of the United States and all his Cabinet members combined.

As far as we know all this doesn't prove a thing.

But we believe that if we keep such information in mind it helps us not merely to understand our government better but to be a little more tolerant of its ever-rising costs.

For the federal government, itself, employs only two and a half million civilian workers compared with the eight million employed by private firms to supply the things bought by the government.

How these private firms operate their business and what wages they pay, therefore, has as much to do with the cost and efficiency of the federal government as does the government's own operations.

Liberals, Unite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as primary campaigns and periodicals have made clear during the last few months, there is a division of opinion in the country about what constitutes "liberalism." This division has the disadvantage of dividing the liberal ranks, as it has been pointed out, but it also has the advantage of forcing liberals to reexamine their own views rather than smugly to sit back and continue to accept past positions.

In the June 24 issue of Aufbau, Von Hans Steinitz takes note of the problem. Liberals are "bitter, confused and breaking up," he writes. He then goes on to recommend that liberals unite around a basic program which he briefly outlines.

His comments, I think, should be of interest to liberals and conservatives alike. The column, entitled "Liberals, Unite," follows:

LIBERALS, UNITE

(By Von Hans Steinitz)

American Liberalism is in bad shape. The forces of progress and reform, which in this country are known by the somewhat misleading catch-all name of "Liberalism," are split, discouraged, bitter, confused and breaking up. They are helplessly looking for new ideas and purposes, for new formulas and programs which might pull them together and give their set of values a new lease on life.

Hardly two years ago, everything was clear and simple. American Liberals, overcoming their original skepticism, had gathered around President Johnson, then at the threshold of his 1964 Presidential campaign. He was opposed by Senator Goldwater, representing all elements of yesteryear, standing for everything that Liberals opposed, and their choice was easy. They could look back on some splendid accomplishments in the field of civil rights: their sit-ins, their Freedom rides, their March to Washington, their fraternal "We shall overcome" demonstrations for better citizenship; they had just stood up against what was then called "the white backlash," they had achieved results, good new laws had been passed, and good new programs had been proclaimed by the man in the White House.

After his overwhelming victory at the polls, Congress followed suit. Liberals saw tangible progress: bright new reforms, the first steps toward the "Great Society," courageous attacks on the perennial evils in our big cities, our schools, our countryside, our rural slums, the neglect of our elderly. And Liberals were more hopeful, more united, more confident than ever.

Then came the backlash, the real one. The tragic developments in Vietnam took their toll, splitting the liberal community wide open. The civil rights movement lost its momentum—and was further weakened by the appearance of a militant new "black nationalism": easily explained, easily understood, and yet an ugly spot on the broad united front of liberal whites and colored. The pacifist Left (or "New Left") rose against LBJ, and even more bitterly against Vice President HUMPHREY, hitherto the undisputed leader of all liberal forces. While some Liberals continue to support the government's policy in Vietnam, albeit reluctantly, others, the majority, have long dissociated themselves from it—without, however, knowing exactly what other course to follow in this diabolic situation.

The result is uneasiness, malaise, despair, confusion. Furthermore, it has shown up in the latest primaries: the conservative right of the Goldwater-heir Ronald Reagan reasserted itself, the democratic primaries suffered from intramural party squabbles between "doves" and Johnson supporters, with inconclusive results; bitterness increases, hopes diminish. America seems to move toward the right—for want of cohesion and vigor in the liberal camp.

Is this unavoidable? Is there no remedy for the sick liberal body politic? Do we merely have to stand by and watch the decline and fall of the heritage of Franklin Roosevelt and Adlai Stevenson? Cannot the Liberals be united again? Granted that Liberalism—as HUBERT HUMPHREY put it—is no dogma and may very well thrive through dissent and debate; yet a minimum of common goals would be necessary to galvanize it and inspire it with new vigor. Given the calamities of Vietnam and the loss of momentum in the civil rights movement: can such a minimum set of new goals be achieved?

Let us try to sketch such a minimum program. By playing down all controversial issues, cannot a set of common goals be lined up on which Liberals of all factions—from the pacifist "New Left" to the labor unions, the civil rights workers and the more old-fashioned big-city intellectuals—might agree? Cannot a measure of new vitality be achieved just by concentrating on what unites them and disregarding what pulls them apart?

Liberals of all shades can agree on the original vision of the "Great Society" and support its implementation—a big job ahead. They can, and should, enthusiastically agree on programs of urbanism and the protection of nature, of school reforms and public transportation, of public health and guarantees for senior citizens. They could agree on a bigger role of government inspection in the fields of drug control and automobile safety, on truthful packaging and advertising.

They could, and should, agree on continued vigilance in the field of civil rights—not so much for further laws, but for enforcing the application of the existing ones; pushing for peaceful progress on the social and human level, always remembering that the goal remains honest equality for all citizens.

In foreign affairs—the most delicate field of them all—Liberals ought to strive in a forceful united front for a solution of the Vietnam war at the conference table, as was done twelve years ago in Geneva. They should oppose senseless escalation, militarist "No-substitute-for victory"-ideas, and the haughty neglect of all civilian reform moves. On the other hand, the Liberals ought not to endorse unilateral and unconditional surrender of the American forces in Vietnam: the war should be ended by conference, and not by any dictates on either side.

Liberals should furthermore, and quite urgently, support the new wave of east-west contacts in Europe, the reduction of cold war tensions, the loosening of military alliances, the improved atmosphere of east-west trade, travel and cultural exchanges: a wide field which Liberals have seldom explored enough.

Could this be a new beginning? Could these modest minimum goals be instrumental in welding together what acrimonious dissension has lately torn apart? Could Liberalism, once Americas proudest political force, be brought to the forefront again, ready to carry on? Is it not high time for Liberals to unite, in the interest of all that still needs to be done?

Federal Versus Local

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I have long been an advocate of the concept of the Federal Government sharing part of its revenues with the States. I think this approach of Federal-State tax cooperation is essential if the State and local governments are to survive in an era of accelerating authority by the National Government. My bill, H.R. 10696, would authorize the Federal Government to share up to 5 percent of its income with the States for use in strengthening education. This legislation has received wide support among tax authorities, Governors, educators ,and Members of Congress.

Mr. Henry C. Wallich, one of the top economists, teachers, and journalists in our country today, wrote a most persuasive column in the June 27 Newsweek citing the urgency in adopting a tax sharing plan. Under unanimous consent I include the article "Federal Versus Local" in the Appendix of the Record.

Federal Versus Local

(By Henry C. Wallich)

Mayor John Lindsay's epic battle for the budget of New York City has laid bare the malaise that afflicts state and local finances throughout the United States. The finances of New York City have been mismanaged, to be sure. But if that were all, Mayor Lindsay's troubles would be minor. The real problem is one of financial incompatibility between the services a large city should provide and the resources upon which it can draw. This may end in a divorce of local responsibility to provide services from political power to control them. If the mayor of a large city cannot raise the money he needs to do his job, control of the city's affairs inevitably slips from his and his constituents' hands.

As Mayor Lindsay—and many of his colleagues elsewhere—contemplates his deficit, he does not have far to look for the causes. Many people want to work in the city, but only the very rich—and the very poor—can afford to live and raise their children there. The city must provide a rich menu of services to many people who do not pay for them. So the mayor tries to reach out into the suburbs to tax the commuter. There he encounters the resistance of the state government.

COMPETITION IN LAXITY

New York State is no ogre. Like all other states, it contributes heavily already to the support of its cities. Nationwide, states finance their cities to the tune of almost 30 per cent of local general revenues. But neither New York nor any other state operates a gold mine. And other resources are hard to come by for state governments, much in contrast to their big Federal brother.

At first blush this seems hard to understand. When one compares the usual tax rates of states with the rates charged by the Federal government, the impression is that the states ought to have a much easier time increasing their revenues than would the Federal government. It is easier to double a 3 per cent sales tax than a 48 per cent corporate-profits tax.

To argue this line is to overlook the competition in tax laxity to which our states are committed. The state or city which pushes its taxes out of line loses its industries. The New York Stock Exchange has been trying to make that clear to Mayor Lindsay. Hence the difficulty in raising state and local revenues. Hence the difficulty in providing the services that must be paid out of those revenues.

A POWER VACUUM

The Federal government, which abhors a vacuum, may feel tempted to step in and fill the gap. Already it has injected itself by making conditional grants to the states for amounts now budgeted at $14.7 billion. Each grant twists the arms, more or less gently, of some state or local authority: "Do this, do that, or do without the money." Much of the time, no doubt, the Federal government's standards are reasonable. The Federal government, by and large, is honest and competent. Not all state and local administrations are. But if we want limited government, we cannot let the Federal government acquire unlimited power.

A logical way out of this dilemma is shown by the widely discussed Heller-Pechman plan providing for unconditional grants of Federal money to the states. The plan uses the great financial power of the Federal revenue system, but does not let it be translated into political power over state and local authorities. The plan incurs the risk that some states may not make the "right" use of the money. They may even take advantage of it to cut their own taxes. The answer to critics who make this point, located mainly on the political left, must be that the money after all is the taxpayers'. If the taxpayers of some states prefer the money to the services, why shouldn't that be their privilege?

Senator Javits of New York has offered a bill embodying the main features of this plan. The humiliating struggle between the City and the State of New York demonstrates the urgency of channeling some Federal money, with no strings attached, to the local level. The Federal government, comfortably off as it is, may feel that its present method of tied grants has worked well enough. But here is one case where to leave well enough alone means to let things go from bad to worse.

Awaiting Johnson's Promised Word on Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members of this Congress are very much aware of the numerous problems that have been caused by the current airline strike. Much has appeared in print concerning the matter, as well as many statements that have been made by public officials. One of the finest articles that I have read is one that was written by Clayton Fritchey. I believe that this fine article will be of interest to all the Members. I, therefore, have leave to have it printed in the Record:

Awaiting Johnson's Promised Word on Strikes

(By Clayton Fritchey)

In his State of the Union message on Jan. 20, President Johnson, in the wake of New York's crippling subway strike, said:

"I intend to ask Congress to consider measures which without improperly invading state and local authority will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest."

That's the last we've heard about that. Six months have gone by and, as the shutdown of the airlines painfully shows, nothing has been done. There has been no White House followup, and none appears on the horizon. In fairness to Johnson, it should be noted that he finds himself in the same dilemma that has frustrated many other White House incumbents. It's easy to talk about doing something; and it is not at all easy to do it. The plain fact is that no President has been able to find a wholly acceptable and effective remedy for strikes that imperil the public interests.

It is also a notable fact that both George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, and Walter Reuther, the number two labor leader, joined Johnson in denouncing the subway strike, but they have not come forward with any new remedies either.

Meany, in his usual constructive fashion, merely said he would oppose any Presidential effort to obtain federal legislation covering city and state employes. Reuther, in his more responsive way, said, "Society can't tolerate stoppages which endanger the very existence of society.

Reuther is wrong. Society not only can, but does tolerate such stoppages. In the last few years there have been big strikes that shut down shipping, building, public schools, newspapers, taxis, buses, and the airlines.

In each instance everybody, including the lawmakers, agreed "there ought to be a law." But it takes time to prepare legislation, and by that time the emergency is over and the pressure is off. It is also then discovered that while strikes are damaging, they seldom prove fatal to the national interest. They just seem to at the time.

At the moment, the country is indignant about the airline shutdown, and there is renewed talk of "doing something," but in the wake of settlement, the passion for reform will, as usual, soon spend itself. The politicians are wise to this. Six months ago everyone thought this session of Congress would certainly pass new strike legislation, but there is little or nothing left of that innocent hope.

Perhaps, after all these years, it is time for us to stop kidding ourselves that there is some miraculous answer to these exasperating, and often stupid strikes, which hurt the innocent bystander—namely the public.

After the Manhattan subway strike, New York State was urged to emulate the National Railway Labor Act, which provides for a National Mediation Board to handle disputes between rail or air carriers and labor unions. It also permits a Presidential Emergency Board to make nonbinding recommendations if mediation fails, and provides for a 30-day cooling-off period before a strike can be called.

Yet in the airline dispute, every step of this procedure was followed, and still there was a strike. That's what prompts recurring demands for compulsory arbitration.

For years this radical but seemingly simple solution has tempted Americans. A recent Gallup poll showed the public 2–1 in favor of it, a large increase over last year. Unfortunately, it has two serious throwbacks.

First, various state experiments with compulsory arbitration have not been too encouraging, nor has experience of other countries where it has been tried nationally.

Second, both labor and management shrink from such critical government intervention, and as long as they feel that way it is unlikely that Congress will go against them.

Still, even if forced arbitration is not the instant answer, Congress has an obligation to develop better strike machinery than we have now. It could do worse than consider the formula sponsored by Senator Javits.

If, under his proposal, a labor dispute did not yield to fact-finding or a compulsory 30-day bargaining period, federal courts, at the President's request, could appoint receivers to operate struck facilities to the extent necessary for health or safety.

If the administration feels this is not a good answer, it would be helpful to know why—and also what its own promised answer is.

Effects of Revision of Residual Import Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised in a letter from Charles W. Colsen, counsel to the New England Council for Economic Research and Development, dated May 31, 1966, that due to revision in the residual oil import quotas announced by the Secretary of the Interior, March 25, 1966, quotations on residual oil in New England were down 35 cents a barrel from the period immediately before the quotas were removed.

It is estimated by the council that this will result in a saving of more than $30 million to the New England consumer. This, I believe, is sufficient evidence of the wisdom of the strong efforts made by all 25 New England Congressmen in bringing to the attention of the OEP and the Secretary of the Interior, the inequities of the system of import quotas. The old system benefited no one and burdened the consumers of New England as well as placing unnecessary strain upon relations with those countries which are principal exporters of residual oil.

We should be aware that under GATT, the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade, subscribed to by some 75 nations, import quotas are regarded as highly inimical to the best interests of world trade. The removal of the import quota on residual oil is in line with GATT policies and I am sure will be so recognized by other signatories in future tariff negotiations.

I am pleased to have had a part in bringing about a decision beneficial to my constituents as well as to our announced policy of liberalized world trade.

Senator Douglas Is Right: Plug the Tax Loopholes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, since last year I have periodically made proposals to reform our Federal tax system which presently affords special privileges to many large companies and the very wealthy.

Senator Paul Douglas, one of our greatest defenders of the public interest, has persistently pushed for the elimination of massive subsidies for privileged groups and individuals. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial pertaining to the tremendous efforts over the years of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. I also would like to say that this editorial very succinctly and accurately points up the urgent need for a prompt and thorough reform of our tax system.

On February 23, 1966, I introduced a bill, H.R. 12993, which is identical to legislation sponsored by Senator Douglas and others in the Senate. Approval of this legislation would be the first step by Congress along the road to an equitable and fair tax system, a move in our best democratic tradition.

The editorial follows:

SENATOR DOUGLAS IS RIGHT: PLUG THE TAX LOOPHOLES!

The tax loopholes scandal was in the news again lately. In one development, newspapers published a "secret" report on an investigation being made by the Internal Revenue Service into 400 cases of possible abuse of the "charity" loophole.

Also, Sen. Paul Douglas (D., Ill.), long a battler against lopsided taxes, put the spotlight anew on innumerable loopholes and called for plugging them to secure added revenue before imposing any general tax increase to finance the Vietnam war.

The 400 cases being studied by the IRS deal with "philanthropists" who claim tax write-offs totalling $4.3 million on gifts of art works that actually cost them less than $1.5 million—and many of whom apparently rolled up handsome cash profits thereby.

Here's an example of how this "gift" scheme operates: A prospective donor buys an art work for $50,000 which he eventually presents to his "alma mater." Before doing so, he has a friendly art appraiser say the work is worth $150,000.

He then deducts the $150,000 as a "charity gift" on his income tax return. If he's in the top bracket of say 50 to 80 per cent, he cuts his tax payments by far more than the $50,000 and ends up with a tidy "profit."

The Los Angeles Times, which first reported the IRS probe, quoted a tax agent as saying that one high bracket taxpayer over a 12-year period claimed contributions of art totaling $813,000 in value, for which he had paid $265,000. His tax saving was said to be over $492,000.

Phony "offers" are also used to inflate the value, the IRS let it be known. For example, the "philanthropist" has an acquaintance offer an inflated price for his art. The owner turns that down, and instead donates the art to his old school. He then uses the pumped-up offer as his figure for income tax deduction purposes.

Douglas cited some glaring examples of the results of other tax loopholes. Latest available Treasury figures, he said, show that 32 persons with incomes of over $500,000 (of whom 20 had incomes of over $1 million) didn't pay a single cent in taxes in 1963!

Why was that? "Because," said Douglas, "of the oil depletion allowances, the capital gains provisions, and the stock options."

Douglas declared that because of the depletion allowance, and related tax loopholes, one oil operator with $26 million in income in one year "paid not one penny in income taxes." Also, a major oil company with profits of $65 million over a five-year period "not only paid no taxes, but received a rebate of $425,000."

"I say, let's plug these tax loopholes," Douglas urged. "Let's abolish lavish subsidies to the well-to-do before we raise the taxes of average American citizens."

Labor wholeheartedly agrees with Senator Douglas. It's time for action by Congress to close the loopholes by which so many of the rich escape paying their fair share while the ordinary worker must pay his taxes in full.

L.B.J. in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson visited Iowa on June 30. He left Washington before noon and did not leave Iowa until almost midnight Washington time. That 12-hour period was packed solidly with events and, of course, could not possibly be fully covered in one article in a newspaper, but the interpretive article which I think probably most nearly portrarys the highlights of the trip is one from the Davenport Times-Democrat of July 3 which I have set forth in the Congressional Record so that others may read it.

I was one of those privileged to accompany the President from Washington to Iowa and to be with him while he was in Iowa. I was in the automobile with the President as it drove through the streets and roads lined with thousands of people. I was also in the automobile with the President as he drove through the same streets in the fall of 1964.

From this vantage point, sitting in the automobile with the President, I could see the expression on the faces of the people as they viewed the President. On both occasions they were clearly saying, "That is our President, we want to greet him, we are depending upon him, he has our best wishes." I could not detect any change in the expressions on the faces of the people and their reactions on the two trips.

When the President would stop and get out of the car to give a personal greeting on a particular street corner, the crowd would simply go wild with enthusiasm and many people were moved to tears. Children would jump up and down with joy; it was a truly moving experience to watch the reaction of the people. When we drove through the countryside, crowds would be accumulated at crossroads and one could see cars parked for a long way back from the crossroads indicating that people had driven for many miles so that they and their children could see the President.

The principal speech lasted 58 minutes because it was interrupted 56 times with applause. The speech was delivered in an auditorium in Des Moines on one of the hottest evenings in history and without the benefit of air conditioning. In spite of this physically uncomfortable situation, the crowd was applauding as often and with as much enthusiasm in in the last 5 minutes of the speech as it was in the first 5 minutes of the speech. Highlights of the speech are set forth in the article I mentioned and which is set forth below:

L.B.J. IN IOWA: STANDS FIRM, NO ALIBIS FOR HIS POLICIES

(By John McCormick of the Times-Democrat staff)

Des Moines.—Anyone who expected President Johnson to be apologetic or offer alibis for any of his administration's policies and statements was sorely disappointed in L.B.J.'s visit to Iowa Thursday.

In his curbstone and barnyard chats with the crowd that turned out to greet him, and in his formal address at a $100-a-plate fund-raising dinner, Johnson made it clear that he stands solidly behind his programs.

He went so far as to bring Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman with him, unannounced, on the foray into the "heartland of the farming industry." Freeman's presence was symbolic of Johnson's full backing of his chief agriculture aide.

There were no apologies nor alibis for the recent statements and actions by both Johnson and Freeman which have stirred some resentment among the nation's farmers.

WORDS DELIVERED CALMLY

Nor were there any for the way the war in Viet Nam is being conducted—another issue that has been severely criticized in many quarters.

While his words were forceful and clear, they were delivered, for the most part, calmly. Johnson's speech lacked the bombast characteristic of political campaigns.

But he came not to arouse people to action. He came to quiet criticism and resentment—to reassure those who are "disturbed and worried"—and to reaffirm that the course he has chosen for the country will be pursued with persistence and perseverance so long as Lyndon B. Johnson is President.

If there was any plea in the President's message, it was for understanding and compassion for any man who bears the "tremendous, terrifying responsibilities of the President of the United States."

FINDS STRENGTH

He said he came to Iowa "to draw strength from you" and found that strength in the "smiling, healthy, happy faces" of the thousands who turned out to welcome him.

And if Iowans object to policies of the Johnson administration, it was not evident in their manner. Only about 100 persons, many of them college students representing dissident factions, put on a display of protest over continuation of the fighting in Viet Nam.

The crowds at the airport for his arrival and departure, the little clusters of farm folk at roadside crossings along the route of Johnson's farm tour, the thousands who lined the streets of Indianola and Des Moines, waved American flags and placards lettered with words of greeting and support.

There probably were some, perhaps many, who differ with Johnson. But in true American fashion, they showed their respect for the office of President of the United States—whatever his name may be.

And Johnson played on this theme.

DECISIONS ARE JOHNSON'S

In his address at a $100-a-plate Democratic dinner that grossed an estimated $250,000 for state and national campaign chests, Johnson emphasized that in 1964 the people of this nation elected "one man, and only one man as your President."

And on that man alone rests the responsibility to make decisions for the nation.

Johnson said he has made decisions and will continue to make them, "based on what is good for the United States and the Free World."

In what might be considered a plea for understanding and compassion, Johnson said grade school history books make it appear that presidents are "forever smiling and self-sufficient . . . never seem to need anything. Besieged by problems on every hand, with the winds of crisis howling all about them, they seem to rest, like some Gibraltar, on a sea of self-assurance."

Johnson said he may some day "rewrite a few chapters of those books" to say something about the needs of a president to have the support of, and to draw strength from "the men, women and children whose servant he is."

NOT ROCK OF GIBRALTAR

"For no matter how steadfast in his determination a president may be, he is not a rock of Gibraltar.

"As you may have heard on the grapevine, he is a plain, simple human being," Johnson said.

It was then that he gave humble thanks for the welcome he received in Iowa.

"Nothing is as satisfying, nothing gives your president more pleasure, than such hospitality as you have shown, and to see so many happy, smiling faces.

"Your president has drawn strength and comfort from the association with you," Johnson said.

He called the "prosperous, healthy, happy people of America" his "hidden asset."

Johnson told of his conference with former Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and the late Herbert C. Hoover, both Republicans, and Democrat Harry S. Truman to get their advice and counsel before making some of his more momentous decisions.

But with all the good advice, counsel and information that a president can muster, it still is he, and he alone, who must make the decisions.

"The problem of the president is not doing what is right. It is knowing what is right," Johnson said.

DEPARTS FROM TEXT

In his dinner speech, Johnson departed frequently from his prepared text, paraphrased other portions, omitted many paragraphs entirely, substituting extemporaneously to piece together what Gov. Harold E. Hughes called "one of the greatest speeches I ever heard him give . . . significant and of nationwide and worldwide importance."

What started out to be a farm policy address replete with statistics was supplemented shortly before delivery time with a hard-hitting text on Viet Nam.

On farm policy, he pointed out the rising per farm income in the last five years, the $3.5 billion in government subsidy payments made to more than 2 million farmers this year, and federal action to curb inflation including efforts to stabilize farm prices.

"It is the story of a successful farm policy unparalleled in the world—and I'm proud of it," Johnson said.

Not only did Johnson not offer apology or alibi for his agricultural programs, he called on the nation's farmers to accept larger commitments "to help more" in providing the food needed by underdeveloped countries where there is "malnourishment, starvation, the weakness that breeds disease and slows production and destroys hope."

"I know that Iowans, who for generations have offered their skills and their humane concern to less fortunate peoples, will not hestiate to do so again," Johnson said. "For because you are those to whom much has been given, so from you is much expected."

CHOKES BACK A SOB

On Viet Nam, Johnson choked back a sob and squinted his eyes as if to stop a tear as he spoke of American casualties.

"I want to get out as bad as any boy standing tonight in a rice paddy of Viet Nam. And they all want to get out," Johnson said. "But not one of those boys has written his President asking to get out, except with honor."

Johnson left no doubt in the minds of Americans, their allies and enemies that he has no intention of slackening the Viet Nam effort.

"If we quit the fight—if we abandon our effort to keep stability in Asia—every nation there will once again be an easy prey for hungry Communist appetites.

"So firmness is a must. And as long as I am President, we will stand firm," he said.

At the same time he left the door unconditionally open to the Communist leaders of North Viet Nam to negotiate peace.

TONES ARE PLAINTIVE

His tones were plaintive as he said, "If they will only let me know when and where they would like to ask us directly what can be done to bring peace in South Viet Nam, I will have my closest and most trusted associates there in a matter of hours.

"This is one way to stop the fighting. It is one way to move toward peace. It is one way to end the killing in the South and the bombing in the North.

"And this, of course, is our desire.

"They cannot wear us down. And they cannot escape paying a very high price for their aggression if they continue with their evil acts.

"We do not want to be bellicose or belligerent. The minute they change their mind—the minute they decide the price is too high for a policy that cannot succeed—we will be waiting.

"None of this, my friends, will be easy. But a world of small and new nations—a world where our word and our power can mean the difference between war and peace—is counting on us to produce the imagination and the initiative.

"We will not fail them."

The Great Unfinished Job of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the supreme purpose of the United Nations is to maintain peace and prevent war. In that connection I introduced last June House Concurrent Resolution 689 to establish a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force and House Concurrent Resolution 794 urging free elections in South Vietnam supervised by the U.N.

In support of this legislation, and because I believe with U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg that "I cannot escape the deep sense that the peoples of the world are looking over our shoulders waiting to see whether we can overcome our present problems and take up with fresh vigor and renewed resolution the great unfinished job of peace," I insert in the RECORD an article by Scripps-Howard Writer Hal Hendrix, complimenting the impressive efforts of the first inter-American peace force which helped restore democratic constitutional government to the Dominican Republic.

PEACE FORCE HELPED ARMY IN DOMINICAN: TROUBLEMAKERS TODAY WOULD FACE TRAINED MILITARY

(By Hal Hendrix)

SANTO DOMINGO, July 12.—The hemisphere's first Inter-American peace force, which helped restore democratic constitutional government to the Dominican Republic, has begun its gradual withdrawal.

Departure of the foreign troops after 14 months here has arounsed contrasting reaction among the Dominicans. Some are glad, some sad.

Some fear new violence as soon as the last of the 8000-man force leaves. Extremists of the left and right have been itching to get at each other with hidden weapons.

CONDITION CHANGED

But any such troublemakers would find the Dominican military and police today aren't the same disorganized, ill-trained units the rebels challenged when the revolution began in April, 1965.

Since then the Dominican armed forces and police have received intensive training in riot control and anti-guerrilla operations. Their tutors were among the best in the trade—the U.S. Special forces.

Withdrawal of the peace force began officially June 28, three days before the inauguration of President Joaquin Balaguer. Unless he requests some to remain longer, all the troops are scheduled to be gone by Sept. 30.

As the dismantling got underway, the U.S. had about 6500 men here. Another 1200 were divided between Brazil, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras and Paraguay.

The arguments were over the intervention and presence of the peace force will continue long after the foreign troops have departed.

OPINIONS DIFFER

Many Dominicans are convinced the landing of foreign troops saved the country from catastrophe.

But critics of the intervention, the rebel or so-called "Constitutionalists," charge it frustrated a movement that could have achieved constitutional rule in less time and at far less expense.

But the result of the June 1 presidential election argues against the rebel critics. Their man, Juan Bosch, whom the rebels wanted to put back into the palace by violent revolution, was overwhelmingly defeated by the Dominican electorate.

U.S. and OAS officials have declined to reveal how much it has cost to send and maintain the peace force here. Presumably most, if not all, the logistical costs have been borne by the U.S.

U.S. INSTALLATIONS

Scattered about the city have been field hospitals, telephone switchboards, emergency power plants, huge banks of food freezing units, miles of wiring.

Circulating libraries, post exchanges, military post offices, barbershops, a printing plant and a radio station for entertainment and news broadcast in English, Spanish and Portuguese.

The peace force at its peak had some 1750 jeeps and trucks and a fleet of helicopters.

Hoffman-La Roche Indigent Patient Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to call to the attention of the Congress and the American people the indigent patient program conducted by the Roche Laboratories of Hoffman-LaRoche Inc., Nutley, N.J., a pharmaceutical house in my district. This pharmaceutical company has pioneered in the institution of this program in the drug industry, for they have long considered it their obligation to make available a selection of their drugs without cost to indigent sick and handicapped patients in the care of private practicing physicians.

It is in the highest tradition of American medicine for physicians in private practice to care for indigent patients whenever possible, and Roche assists the medical profession in this endeavor by making its products available free of charge.

This splendid example of humanitarianism was introduced during May of 1962. All of the drugs are obtained by the treating physician who informs Roche of the circumstances of each case, the medication needed, and the dosage strength. Hoffman-La Roche does not require the doctor to reveal the patient's name and should the indigent require additional medication, the physician may write to the company and request additional supplies for as long as the patient requires it.

I want to commend one of the world's largest pharmaceutical companies for the inauguration of such a program of merit. Once again, we see that it is possible for self-sacrifice and the desire to aid our fellowman to overshadow the profit motive. Even though we enjoy today a most progressive and rich society, there still remain many unfortunate people who are suffering from the effects of ill health and poverty.

The Roche indigent patient program is indicative of the manner in which private industry can work to insure a more secure and comfortable life for our citizens.

Soviet Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, at this critical time, when the Soviet Union seeks to convince the world that communism is the wave of the future, it is significant to note the inadequacies of their education system as related in the current issue of Time magazine.

It seems that their boast of the availability of college opportunities is more fiction than fact. It also appears that, in admissions to colleges, some are "more equal" than others. For the benefit of the House, I include an article from the educational section of Time magazine for July 15, 1966:

EXAM FEVER IN RUSSIA

In city, town and village across the vast plains, students last week burned the midnight oil as they crammed for university entrance exams. Providing moral support, their parents besieged admissions officers with pleading telegrams, desperately sought out the help of influential friends in politics or government. Doctors suddenly found themselves busy trying to stamp out an epidemic of youthful exhaustion and nervous tension.

Far worse than the admissions crush at the Ivies or Oxbridge, so it seems, is the placement struggle currently taking place in that self-styled educational paradise, the Soviet Union. Although Russia claims to spare no rubles when it comes to schooling, its universities and technical institutes are sadly inadequate to meet the national demand.

* * * * *

University candidates sweat through ten or more *zachety*, or trial tests, before being allowed to take the major exams given by the government during June and July. Moreover, even a top grade is no guarantee of admission. Students with some factory or military experience have an edge in the selection; so especially have those with a well-placed friend in the party apparatus.

A university diploma, as every Soviet schoolboy knows, is an essential passport to a white-collar job and ultimate success. Inevitably, the competition for college has led to a displeasing amount of corruption. This spring, reported Komsomolskaya Pravda, 32 students were expelled from the Armenian state university in Erivan when authorities discovered that they had gained their admission through political influence and faked records, and had not passed a single entrance test.

National Federation of Independent Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have known the National Federation of Independent Business organization and its founder for many years.

The recent action by the Senate on H.R. 318 came as a great disappointment to this group and especially to Mr. Burger who has spent a great deal of time and effort in this attempt to equalize competitive positions between the independently owned tirestores and company-operated establishments.

After many years of effort, the House finally granted relief, however, the Senate action may doom the House amendments.

I present Mr. Burger's letter to me covering this situation.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., July 11, 1966.

Re H.R. 318.
The Honorable JOHN DENT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DENT: Following up my visit with you shortly before the recess on Thursday, June 30, you said "George, write me on the proposition," referring to the action of the Senate Finance Committee on June 21, 1966, on H.R. 318, which was voted unanimously by the House in the Fall of 1965, which would compel tire manufacturers owning and operating retail stores to pay the excise tax on their stocks of tires in their retail stores in the same manner and form as independent retailers have been compelled to pay for over a quarter of a century. I am not unmindful of your splendid action at the time the bill came up for a vote on the floor of the House.

I am also reminded of the splendid remarks you made on the floor of the House on October 5, 1965, when the subject matter was before the House for consideration. You said, "Mr. Speaker, one of the dangers of the so-called company-owned stores is the danger of monopoly." You hit the nail on the head in no uncertain words.

The Ways and Means Committee in its report stated its findings were that through this concession, the tire manufacturers owning and operating retail stores—their stocks of tires are exempt of the tax to the extent of approximately $3 million.

It is interesting to note, my good friend, that at the public hearings on June 21, 1966, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, through their spokesmen from General, Goodyear, and Firestone stated that if the five companies operating retail stores had to pay this tax in the same manner and form as the independents, they would be compelled to pay $12,400,000 to the Government. It is my opinion that if a real thorough check was made as to this figure, it might disclose double or triple that amount.

It is our hope and trust that the Senate Finance Committee will repeat its action of last June when they called it "meritorious" legislation and reported the bill out to the floor of the Senate.

I would be more than pleased if you would find it convenient, my good friend, to insert this in the Appendix of the Record with the attachments.

Sincerely,
George J. Burger, *Vice President.*

Attachment.

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, June 22, 1966]

Tire Tax Speedup Not Worth It, Treasury Says

(By Philip Meyer)

Washington.—The Treasury Department Tuesday asked the Senate to forget about a proposed speedup in tire excise tax collections.

Even though the move would bring the Treasury from $5 million to $12 million, it wouldn't be worth the trouble, said Lawrence M. Stone, the department's tax legislative counsel.

Stone and spokesmen for the tire industry testified before the Senate Finance Committee.

"I take it," said Sen. Clinton Anderson (D–N. M.), "that you are strongly opposed to the bill."

"I wouldn't use the word 'strongly,'" replied Stone. "We're opposed to it. But it's not a matter of life or death."

The Rubber Manufacturers' Association (RMA) is strongly opposed. Patrick J. Moran, chief tax counsel for General Tire, said the bill would place "an additional financial burden on the tire manufacturers and an unnecessary administrative burden on the Internal Revenue Service."

Pressure for the bill comes from independent tire dealers, represented at the hearings by George Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

Burger said the present system of tax collection is unfair to the independents.

He figures it this way:

The 10-cent a pound tax is collected when the tire is sold. For the independent dealer, this comes when he buys the tire from the manufacturer. But for the manufacturer-owned store, there is no sale until the retail customer gets the tire.

The proposed bill, which passed the House last year, would equalize matters by collecting from company stores when they receive the tires from the plant.

The present system gives company stores an unfair advantage, Burger said, because independent dealers must "maintain continuing sizable investments in prepaid Federal taxes" on their inventory.

But the Treasury Department and the RMA said the inequity is not as great as Burger pictures it.

The average tire dealer turns over his stock every 95 days and pays the manufacturer 86 days after delivery. This means, he said, that the dealer carries a tax-paid inventory for only nine days.

His only loss, said Stone, is the interest he could have earned for nine days on money tied up in taxes. It figures out, he said, to about 1¼ cents a month for each tire.

The price of wiping out this small inequity would be a confusing new system of tax rolls, he said.

The proposed change got this far only by accident. It passed the House under suspension of the rules, a procedure reserved for non-controversial bills.

Rep. William Ayres of Akron was present at the time and intended to declare the bill controversial. But he was called to the phone just before the bill was called up and missed his chance.

The Editor,
Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.:

Front page Wall Street Journal today says that "Independent tire dealers try to persuade Congress to exempt them from having to pay excise tax on tire stocks at the time they are purchased from the manufacturer." This is not true as the record will show in Congressional hearings on the subject matter for nearly a quarter of a century tire dealers have requested that the stocks of tires and tubes in manufacturers' retail stores be taxed in the same manner and form as the independent tire dealers are subject to. What they are requesting in simple words is equal justice under the law. As a benefit to all of your readers, will you make this correction?

George J. Burger,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington, D.C.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 29, 1966]

Independent tire dealers strive to persuade Congress to exempt them from having to pay excise taxes on tire stocks at the time of purchase from the manufacturers. The independent dealers maintain that the tax law discriminates against them because retail outlets owned by the tire makers aren't required to pay excise levies until tires are sold; under present law, such intra-company transactions don't count as sales. Congressional tax-writing committees seem sympathetic to the independent tire sellers' plea, but Treasury opposition may block a bill that would give them relief. The Treasury argues that changing the rules for non-affiliated tire dealers would prompt similar pleas from other independent retailers, such as truck dealers, who also must pay excise taxes in advance, leading to "administrative and compliance problems."

Wall Street Journal made the correction on July 1, 1966, and advised me accordingly.

President's Address Memorable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence in today's Washington Star very ably sets forth the full import of the President's Tuesday night television and radio address. This very clearly again shows the efforts the President exerts to bring to an end the Vietnam conflict.

I ask that Mr. Lawrence's article be inserted following my remarks.

President's Address Memorable

(By David Lawrence)

A memorable address delivered by President Johnson over television and radio on Tuesday night could change the course of human history. For the first time, the head of a nation talked directly to another people in the midst of a war. He earnestly pleaded the cause of peace and emphasized that "cooperation, not hostility, is the way of the future."

Mr. Johnson's speech was neither belligerent in tone nor blustering. The President tried the art of persuasion. He pointed out that, since "humiliation can be the seedbed of war," America is not seeking in Viet Nam "the peace of conquest."

Stressing what could lie beyond a peace conference, Mr. Johnson spoke of the need to strengthen the economic and social development of countries in Asia with their enormous populations which suffer from poverty, hunger and disease.

The President may have been thinking of Red China's detachment from the world community as he tactfully argued that isolationism is not good for China any more than it has been for the United States. He said on this point:

"Americans entered this century believing that our security had no foundation outside our own continent. Twice we mistook our sheltered position for safety. Twice we were wrong. If we are wise now, we will not repeat our mistakes of the past. We will not retreat from the obligations of freedom and security in Asia."

The President's frank and outspoken words might have been uttered in the privacy of a "summit" meeting with the heads of other governments. But they take on added significance because of their directness and the willingness to make such statements in the open. Here are the significant passages:

"As long as the leaders of North Viet Nam believe they can take over the people of South Viet Nam by force, we must not let them succeed.

"We must stand across their path and say: "You will not prevail. Turn from the use of force—and peace will follow.' . . .

"We are not trying to wipe out North Viet Nam. We are not trying to change their government. We are not trying to establish permanent bases in South Viet Nam. And we are not trying to gain one inch of new territory. Then why are we there?

"Because we are trying to make the Communists of North Viet Nam stop shooting at their neighbors. Because we are trying to make their aggression unprofitable. Because we are trying to demonstrate that guerrilla warfare, inspired by one nation against another, cannot succeed. Once that lesson is learned, a shadow that hangs over all of Asia will begin to recede . . .

"However long it takes, I want the Communists in Hanoi to know where we stand.

"First, victory for your armies is impossible. You cannot drive us from South Viet Nam by force. Do not mistake our firm stand for false optimism—as long as you persist in aggression, we will resist.

"Second, the minute you realize that a military victory is out of the question, and turn from the use of force, you will find us ready to reciprocate. We want to end the fighting. We want to bring our men home. We want an honorable peace in Viet Nam. In your hands is the key to that peace. You have only to turn it."

Rarely in the relations between two adversaries during a war has such frankness been displayed, at least on the part of the nation which has the more powerful military force and weapons. The strategy behind the kind of speech that President Johnson delivered may not be apparent to the naked eye, but it doubtless was based on the advice of those experts here and abroad who know what's happening inside Red China and who recognize that this is the time to present to the people on the mainland a formula that could lead to peace. The President said:

"A hostile China must be discouraged from aggression. A misguided China must be encouraged toward understanding of the outside world and toward policies of peaceful cooperation. For lasting peace can never come to Asia as long as the 700 million people of mainland China are isolated by their rulers from the outside world."

The text of the President's address doubtless will be relayed by radio throughout the world. At least the diplomats will read it in full text, and those who have contact with Red China's government are in a position to point out that never has there been a more sincere or constructive declaration made to an enemy during a war than that which has just been proclaimed by the President of the United States in a conscientious effort to bring peace in Viet Nam.

Self-Help: A Challenge of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN W. DYAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I requested a report from the gentleman who has written the following letter and I am tremendously impressed with the job that is being done in South America under AID. I felt that his letter would be helpful to the hearings we have been holding and to the understanding of the public of the accomplishments in this field:

SELF-HELP: A CHALLENGE OF THE FUTURE

The challenges to America today will be dwarfed by the challenging problems facing America in the future. In one area alone Latin America, we are confronted with the problems that bear not only on the world scene but on our own immediate future as well. Today we face more than twenty nations representing 200 million people, tomorrow we must deal with these same sister countries representing 600 million demanding citizens. How we meet these demands and cope with these problems may well shape the course of our own nation as well.

Much has been written about AID's failures and very little about its success, because seemingly so many people like to point out errors but leave success to minor gibes that they were probably errors to begin with that somehow managed to become successes.

The following story represents a program that was planned to be successful and has remained just that, a story of self-help, where man's humanity to man has made possible the education of thousands of children.

Self help school construction, its concepts and its basic ideas originated in Guatemala in 1960, long before the Alliance was a new theme of our overseas program.

The U.S. AID Guatemala school construction program was the basis in the past for what is now known as the self-help concept of the future, a concept now so popular in all of our efforts throughout the world. This program of community effort, coupled with the Cooperating country and the U.S., built some 2250 classrooms in Guatemala, and these same concepts and ideas spread to El Salvador, Nicaragua, Panama, and Ecuador. The author of this paper must say that it was the vision of all people concerned that made these programs the success story that they are today.

Ecuador represents the culmination of all our past efforts to sell the concept that man, in the interest of his children for a better way of life, will make every sacrifice to overcome practically any obstacle to see that his child receives an education.

The Cooperative Program of School Construction was created by an Agreement signed May 17, 1962 between the U.S. AID and the Government of Ecuador. Its primary objective was to prepare and train personnel for a new division in the Ministry of Education to assume the responsibilities of a future AID loan based on the Self-Help concept. Its primary objective then was institution building coupled with results, building school rooms.

A series of studies conducted by AID/E, and other agencies had estimated that as of December of 1963, Ecuador's classroom shortage amounted to 11,000 classrooms; that Ecuadorian resources from the central government alone could not solve this shortage. Further, during this same year 300,000 children would not attend school because of this classroom shortage. Of those in school in the 1st. to the sixth grades, 87% would drop out before finishing the sixth grade, primarily because of lack of classrooms, which within ten years would increase the illiteracy figure from a conservative estimate of 43% to possibly 50–60%.

The U.S. AID pilot project created a Cooperative Program of School Construction to help the Government of Ecuador to solve this lack of money resources and the resulting waste of human resources. The Cooperative was created as a bilateral organization co-directed by a USAID construction engineer and the Chief of School Construction of the Ministry of Education. This bilateral organization administers the construction of schools based upon tri-lateral and bilateral agreements signed between the Cooperative Program of School Construction, the Provinces, Municipalities, Pueblos, CARE, and other civic groups participating in the program.

The original agreement specified the following:

(A) CONTRIBUTIONS

1. United States, $200,000.
(a) Imported materials, cash.
2. GOE, $200,000.
(a) Cash.
3. Communities, $200,000.
(a) Land, material, labor, cash.

(B) OBJECTIVE: 300 CLASSROOMS

Within the Original Pilot Project monies outlined above constructed 420 classrooms and 28 teacher's lodgings from funds projected for 300 classrooms. This was possible through over subscription to the program by the government and the people throughout the country. It further integrated 34 members of the Peace Corps into a Community Development section of the project, and initiated a Food for Peace Program which provided a noon meal for workers contributing their labor.

From May of 1962 until April 1966 the original Agreement has been amended seven times. Each of these amendments were requested by the Officials of the Cooperating country and they stemmed from a realization that self-help and its saving to the Central Government could be extended to vocational and secondary programs as well. These amendments covered many aspects that were not projected in the original agreement. Each amendment in reality broadened the responsibility of the Cooperative to include not only the engineering, the development and the construction of primary schools, but the more complex administrative planning and construction of vocational and secondary schools.

In view of the success of the Cooperative and its low construction cost the Minister asked the Cooperative Organization in 1963 to construct six vocational schools in addition to the pilot primary project for the Ministry of Education, representing an additional expenditure of $935,000 on the part of the GOE without additional contributions from the U.S. Five of the schools are finished and occupied at this time.

In addition to this overall program between AID, the GOE and the people of Ecuador, a people-to-people and town-to-town plan was inaugurated in 1965, through CARE. This program has involved the building of one and two room schools, including kitchens, lodgins for teachers and the provision of desks for 40 students per classroom, by a cooperative effort on the part of CARE, the Cooperative Program of School Construction (CPSC), the Peace Corps and Local Communities.

CARE provides a standardized donation of $1,500 and $2,250, contributed primarily from civic service organization in the U.S. which through individual contracts, are transferred to the account of the CPSC.

The Local Communities as in the pilot program contribute with land, labor and materials, a contribution which has generally amounted to 35% of the total land and construction costs. The CPSC purchases and delivers the material to the school site, and the Cooperative Engineers supervise and direct the Peace Corps Volunteers.

As of April 1966, then, the Cooperative has expanded its operations to accomplish the following:

A. Contributions:

1. United States (cash, materials)	$366,618.56
2. GOE (cash)	2,438,482.10
(a) Ministry budget	1,724,514.00
(b) Public Law 480 loan	715,071.50
3. Community	836,120.50
(a) Land, material, labor, cash.	
4. CARE	13,737.89
(a) U.S. citizens to Ecuadoran communities (cash).	
5. Private Ecuadoran Contributions	166,476.89
Total Contributions	3,821,448.90
(a) 18.18 (O.R.E.)	

AID's Contribution:

(a) 9.8% of construction and administrative cost.	
(b) Technical Administrative and advisory cost for 4 years	140,000

B. Accomplishments of the total program:

	Students
1. 1,267 primary classrooms and teachers' lodging	56,000
2. 5 vocational schools	4,000
3. 1 secondary school	1,200
4. 3 normal school additions	800
Total	69,000

C. Cost and time factors: (1) Classrooms constructed prior to 1962 averaged $2,900. Cooperative school costs averaged $2,000 which includes classroom furniture. (2) Schools constructed by the Ministries Construction Department took as long as 2 years to build because of the deficit financing plan. Cooperative Schools have averaged six months in building. (3) The Self-Help factor has reduced the National budget outlay for primary schools and construction sites by 40%.

After nearly four years of preparation in engineering and establishing administrative practices, the bases for a National School Construction Agency to be created by the Government is nearing reality. This agency of the Minister of Education will be charged with planning and administering construction of all primary, secondary and vocational schools in the country. It is to be formed from the employees of the original Cooperative Program of School Construction and will also absorb the construction department of the Ministry of Education.

The establishment of this New National Agency forms the bases for an 11 million dollar, 3000 classroom school construction program. The U.S. government has granted a 5.3 million dollar loan for the construction of schools, training of teachers and the development of a national text book program.

From the concept of an idea in Guatemala in 1960 to the accomplishments of the people of Ecuador in 1966, we have experienced many errors, frustrations and periods of change. But change is brought about through desires, and no greater desire exists than the need for a better way of life. A better way of life through education.

JAMES F. W. WATSON,
Construction Engineer, Chief School Construction.

Essays of Sixth Grade Students at Roger Sherman School: Commemoration of U.N. 20th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on June 21, 1965, the students of the sixth grade at the Roger Sherman School in conjunction with the commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations, planted trees along the path of peace—Edgewood Mall, in New Haven, Conn. To accompany the tree planting, some of the children wrote short essays giving their impressions of public figures who they feel, have made contributions to the spirit of the United Nations.

Children, I have found, sometimes have the enviable ability to see through the rhetoric which clouds the issues of our day, to their essence. I thought that my colleagues might enjoy sharing in the simple eloquence of their words.

A Prayer

(By Samuel Hurwitz, age 11)

Thank you God for giving us a world where peace overshadows war, love overshadows hate, and freedom overshadows slavery.

We are here now to honor men and women who have helped to make it that way. May other people be inspired, and carry on, as the U.N. has been doing for twenty years.

Maybe, someday, if everyone works hard and long, our prayers may be answered. Then everyone will live in peace and good will. Amen.

Big Heart

(By Nancy Kasimer)

The United Nations has a big heart trying to help mankind reach the great goals of an educated world, a healthy world, a friendly world, a world without war, and most of all a happy and peaceful world.

The Big Heart went to needy countries and distributed dry powdered milk, flour, grain, and advice. They met poverty, disease, ignorance, hunger, overcrowded cities, unemployment, city life, street life, and naked children roaming the streets. With these wretched sights in mind W.H.O., World Health Organization, attacked disease armed with injections, medicines, doctors, nurses, sanitation and nutrition experts, medical officers, physicians, and other people involved in medicine.

U.N.I.C.E.F., United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, was fighting hunger in many countries all over the world where the people were too weak to work, think and improve.

T.A., Technical Assistants, taught the people new trades which the people had never heard of before. They showed them modern machinery and taught them how to use them.

Along with T.A. comes F.A.O., Food and Agricultural Organization, showing people what crops would grow best, what natural resources they have, how to rotate crops, and other agricultural facts.

The U.N. has equipped the largest dairy in Asia, in Bombay. They learn new ways to process foods with protein in them. They teach the people to prepare and use new foods. The U.N. sprays homes and villages with DDT to kill the malaria carrying mosquitoes and lice. They teach sanitation and provide equipment to build central water wells. They build Health Centers where there is one doctor for every 10,000 people. The U.N. is teaching the parents and the children making less and less ignorance in our world. They teach because they know that there is no future without education. The U.N. supplies creative toys and learning materials.

The U.N. with the big heart has helped many people and is helping more and more everyday.

I think the U.N. has done much for all people, and is a great stepping stone to peace.

President Johnson

(By Jeffrey Zonenshine, age 12)

To President Johnson for what he has done in Appalachia, and for Civil Rights.

What he is doing for his war on poverty and what he is doing for education facilities.

John F. Kennedy

(By Gailene Thornton, age 12)

To John F. Kennedy for his faith, courage and feeling for people.

We are hoping this tree will be a symbol of peace for which he stood.

For he believed that peace, brotherhood, and progress were possible only if the young people of the world faced the future with hope and determination.

John F. Kennedy

(By Craig Fort, age 11)

To John F. Kennedy for his courage and feelings for all man kind.

He believed that in order to make progress the young people of our world today would have to look forward to the future. We are hoping this garden will be a symbol of peace and strength for our world today.

Dwight David Eisenhower

(By Mark Grove, age 12)

To General Eisenhower a great war leader. He was Top Commander of all the Allied Forces. In 1950 Eisenhower was recalled to Military Service by President Truman to serve as Head Commander of NATO. He resigned this post to become the Republican Nominee. Eisenhower won the presidency over Adlai Stevenson. While Eisenhower was president, he passed many bills, such as the Hydroelectric bill. Eisenhower had conferences with South Korean leaders and Top U.N. commanders, meetings with his son Major John Eisenhower, a member of U.N. Forces. On his return from the trip, Eisenhower said that "this journey marks not the end but the beginning of a new effort to make peace through out the world."

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

(By Eugene Esares, age 12)

Franklin D. Roosevelt served many public offices. But in 1933 he was elected thirty-second president of the United States. He was noted for helping the common people. One such law that has helped the United States greatly is Social Security. People looked upon Roosevelt as a loyal friend.

Roosevelt helped to end the depression by providing jobs for the unemployed, in public works.

His death in 1945 was a shock to all people of the world.

Herbert Clark Hoover

(By Kenneth Marder, age 12)

For the good job he did as Food Administrator of the United States during World War I. Beginning his job in 1917, he helped save many lives by feeding the starving people of Europe.

As President, he signed many Commissions the National Commission on Law Observance, and Law Enforcement.

Congressman Giaimo

(By Samuel Hurwitz, age 11)

Because he voted for every bill that was helpful to education. He was on the Appropriations Committee and the Education Committee. He is interested in Medicare and preventing juvenile delinquency.

Mayor Lee

(By Jeffrey Zonenshine, age 12)

To Mayor Lee for what he has done for New Haven with his rehabilitation project—building playgrounds and new and better homes for the senior citizens, new schools, and better schools.

We Thank You: Mr. Coogan

(By Shelley Hankin, age 11)

We would like to give our thanks to Mr. Coogan the head of the New Haven Park Department, for constructing so many beautiful public parks and play areas around New Haven.

Sometimes when I walk through Edgewood Park or any other one, I get such a great feeling that I just stop right there and sit down in the fresh green grass and observe the beautiful things around me. Ever since I can remember, my mother always used to take me to the park to play on the swings.

I always have loved to go down and visit the ducks in the pond at Edgewood Park. It is fun feeding them, and watching them gobble down the food.

During the winter, when I do not have anything to do, I take a little walk to the Edgewood Skating Rink and go ice skating. The ice is beautiful, very clean and smooth. I am really thankful that Mr. Coogan chose such a lovely spot to put the rink. It is so close to everything.

We are showing our appreciation for all he has done by planting a tree in his honor.

Thank you once again, Mr. Coogan.

Marian Anderson

(By Nancy Kasimer, age 12)

We are honoring Miss Marian Anderson for gladdening the hearts of people through her lovely voice. We are also honoring her for sharing her life story with her autobiography, "My Lord, What a Morning," which has inspired so many people. Her life story has been an inspiration to every child in our classroom.

Dag Hammarskjold

(By Ellen Perecman, age 12)

To Dag Hammarskjold who in 1953 was elected Secretary-General of the U.N. While in office, he tried to make peace between the U.S. and Russia. His mind was always on ways to settle world problems, and he wanted to help the needy people of the world. He helped end the fighting between Israel and Egypt in their dispute over the Suez Canal. He created the U.N. Emergency Force to keep the peace. In 1954 he went to Communist China to help free U.S. airmen who were being held captive there. In 1956 he went to the middle-east to try to get them to agree to the Palestine Armistice Agreement. He also made visits to Lebanon and Laos. He died in an airplane crash in

1961, on a mission to aid the Republic of the Congo. A few weeks later he received the Nobel Peace Prize for 1961.

William Horowitz

(By Cheryl Brown, age 11)

To William Horowitz for his love and concern for people.

For all the time he gave to education as Chairman of the Conn. State Department of Education.

For his knowledge and wisdom.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

(By Patricia Haynes, age 11½)

For trying to bring equal rights to the Negroes in the south.

He also helped the Negroes in the south get their civil rights and in 1964 he won the Nobel peace prize.

Jawaharlal Nehru

(By Shelley Hankin, age 11)

To Mr. Nehru for working so hard in helping India gain her freedom and for having such a great and strong love for the children of this world. Another reason why the tree has been planted in his memory is because in 1962, he suggested the resolution of International Cooperation Year to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt

(By Ethel Symolon, age 12)

A tree was planted in honor of Mrs. Roosevelt because she helped many people and donated money to organizations, and was active with the United Nations. In 1947 she was named delegate to the General Assembly of the U.N., was Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission, and also won many awards she was a great humanitarian.

Mrs. Roosevelt died November 7, 1962, the whole world mourned the loss of this great lady.

Mrs. Julia Ruopp

(By Susan Winnick, age 11¾)

To Mrs. Julia Ruopp for founding World Pen Pals which brings children and teachers of more than a hundred countries and territories closer together through letters. And also the volunteers who have come every week for years to help.

Secretary General U Thant

(By DeVeria Grant, age 11)

We planted a tree for Sec. Gen. U Thant for his dedication to bring world peace into a troubled world. He has the hardest job in the world. Sec. Gen. U Thant has had conferences with President Johnson and other people for situations that lead to world peace.

Unicef

(By Jeffrey Zonenshine, age 12)

Unicef and WHO have already safe-guarded 134,000,000 children from T.B.

Unicef has already cured 11,000,000 people from trachoma and conjunctivitis.

Unicef has saved millions of children and mothers by sending milk. Two million line up for milk in Korea alone.

Unicef and WHO has lowered the Malaria death toll from 3,000,000 people to 1,000,000 people.

Unicef and WHO has given penicillin to 31,000,000 people against the disease, Yaws.

It has treated 1,000,000 people against leprosy.

Unicef helps saves lives of mothers, and children.

United States Peace Corps

(By Allan Fine, age 12)

To the United States Peace Corps for their service to the world. They teach people in underdeveloped nations to read, write, plant things, build schools, houses, roads, hospitals, and they help children by fighting diseases. They are not afraid of work and not afraid of discomfort. We thank them for making this a better world.

The tributes which appear in this booklet, all original writings by the children, were recited by them at the Tree Planting Ceremony held on June 21, 1965 at Edgewood Mall.

Food Prices on the Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker every housewife in America has felt the pocketbook pinch during the past few months as she does her weekly grocery shopping.

Rampant inflation caused by prolonged and heavy deficit spending by the Federal Government is to blame for much of the problem, but thus far we have seen no indication the administration intends to offer any relief in the form of reduced spending.

Just how serious this inflation has become is reflected in an outstanding report published in the Indianapolis News on July 8. The article, written by talented Antoni E. Gollan, one of the fine young editorial writers on the staff of the News, indicates that food prices in the Indianapolis area have risen 20 percent in just the last 6 months.

Reports from elsewhere around the Nation indicate this situation is general as the result of uncontrolled spending in Washington.

In order that all Members of Congress receive this excellently researched and highly informative article by Mr. Gollan, I have permission for its publication in the Record. The article follows:

Food Prices Up 20 Percent in 6 Months

(By Antoni E. Gollan)

In just six months, a selected group of food prices at Indianapolis supermarkets have increased by an average of more than 20 per cent.

A cross-check of local major supermarket prices for January and June reveals increases in practically every common food category.

The prices compared were those of the same supermarkets so that price variations among stores were not a factor. Some of the price differences are as follows:

Milk, one gallon: Up from 65 cents to 71 cents.

Wieners, one pound: Up from 49 cents to 59 cents.

Bologna, two pounds: Up from 89 cents to 99 cents.

Potatoes, 10 pounds: Up from 50 cents to 79 cents.

Bread, 1¼ pound loaf: Up from 20 cents to 23 cents.

Ground beef, one pound: Up from 49 cents to 53 cents.

Bacon, one pound: Up from 65 cents to 79 cents.

Coffee, two pounds: Up from $1.39 to $1.49.

Flour, five pounds: Up from 45 cents to 49 cents.

Round steak, one pound: Up from 79 cents to 89 cents.

Rib steak, one pound: Up from 79 cents to 89 cents.

Braunschweiger, two pounds: Up from 89 cents to 99 cents.

Cut frying chicken, one pound: Up from 43 cents to 53 cents.

Beef roast, one pound: Up from 79 cents to 89 cents.

Tuna: One dollar bought four cans in January, three cans in June.

Peaches: Eighty-nine cents bought four cans in January, $1 bought three cans in June.

Catsup: The same price bought a 20-ounce bottle in January, a 14-ounce bottle in June.

Oranges: Five pounds for 49 cents in January, four pounds for 69 cents in June.

These particular price increases during just the past six months are a great deal more accelerated than the 15 per cent rise in the cost of living of the past 10 years.

The general price-increase trend holds true in every local supermarket checked, though ultimately the stores themselves are not to blame.

The reason is inflation. Though its effects are suffered by all, especially those with lower incomes, the causes of inflation are not generally understood.

Inflation is caused almost solely by the policies of government. Says the Encyclopaedia Britannica: "Important inflations can occur only with the acquiescence or active support of the government."

Simply defined, inflation is an increase in the supply of money that exceeds increases in available goods and services. The money thus has less value.

In the United States, the over-supply of money is directly due to deficit spending by the Federal government as it spends far more than it takes in. Deficit spending, an increasingly regular occurrence but one officially approved only so recently as by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, injects more money into the economic system.

A recent survey showed that the money supply in the United States at the present time is nine per cent higher than a year ago—and 47 per cent higher than in 1960.

Deficit spending by the Johnson administration, under the theories of the late British economist John Maynard Keynes, last year was $3.4 billion. This year it is expected to go up to $6.4 billion. And each year Congress is requested to increase the "temporary ceiling" on the already mammoth national debt.

The long-range results could be catastrophic. But one immediate result is the already dramatically higher food prices Indianapolis housewives are forced to pay these days—significantly higher than they were six months ago.

Local homemakers may recall ruefully President Johnson's admonition of a few months ago to buy more selectively for lower prices. The fiscal policies of the administration are rendering such efforts futile.

Eugene F. Nixon Elected to Board of Trustees of Citizens Public Expenditure Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Eugene F. Nixon, my constituent, an outstanding citizen of the Greenwich Village area, has just been elected to the board of trustees of the Citizens Public Expenditure Survey.

The New York State Taxpayer, a publication which recognizes valuable aid to community, featured the fact on the front page of its June 1966 issue, and I commend the item to my colleagues:

E. F. NIXON ELECTED TO C.P.E.S. BOARD

Eugene F. Nixon of New York City and Quogue, New York, has been elected to the Board of Trustees of the Citizen's Public Expenditure Survey.

A native of North Adams, Massachusetts, Mr. Nixon attended schools in North Adams, is a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, Wharton School and a member of Delta Tau Delta.

An account executive with Dreyfus Co. for 15 years, Mr. Nixon has been associated with various Wall Street firms for the last 30 years.

He is president of the Northern Dispensary, a member of the New York State Dental Board, a member of the board of directors of the Long Island Club, and a member of the Quogue Beach Club.

Mr. Nixon is a former Trustee of the Village of Irvington and former District Governor of the Hendrick Hudson Council Boy Scouts of America.

The Truth Shall Make You Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest sermons I have ever read was preached recently by the Reverend Richard B. Sims, pastor of Litz Manor Baptist Church in Kingsport, Tenn., my hometown.

I believe there is no greater statement of the place of religion in our American life, and I am honored to insert the complete text of Reverend Sims' remarks here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SWEET LAND OF LIBERTY

(By Richard B. Sims)

Texts: Psalm 33: 1–12, Psalm 78: 1–7.

The "sweet land of liberty" owes its birthright to the Christian faith and the open Bible. The open Bible has marked out its pathway across the Western world beginning with Paul's answer to the Macedonian call. The Gospel message rode upon the vehicle of Greek, Latin and Hebrew tongues to reach the East, the West, the North, and the South. Whenever a people has enjoyed freedom to read and practice the principles of God's word as set forth in Holy Scriptures that people has become a redeemed people. Their literacy rate rises. Their living standards improve. The respect for the dignity of man appears in the culture. Womanhood is emancipated. Children are accepted, protected, and loved. High standards of morality and ethics are infused with government and business as well as religious organizations. A responsible citizenship emerges to develop a highly refined, tightly-knit society which remains free to propagate spiritual truths and to enhance human welfare.

When the Bible is closed God's voice is hushed for most people in a given society. Whether it be closed by ecclesiastical tyrannies or political despots, the results are the same. The people are left without vision, without faith, without hope. "Where there is no vision the people perish." The decline of the nation begins with the departure from God. In the absence of the inspiration of the Bible the incentives of faith, hope, and love wane. Men lose respect for self, for their fellowman, their country, and the values that have insured freedom. Such a people fall easy prey to the corrupt, egotistical, ambitious political would-be despot who seizes the advantage of circumstances provided by economic depression and moral decay.

The nation that keeps the open Bible will have people with an open heart, an open mind, and an open hand.

The laws of God are inscribed upon the table of this nation's heart. "Then Joshua built an altar unto the Lord God * * * and he wrote there upon the stones a copy of the law * * * and afterward he read all the words of the law * * * according to all that is written in the book of the law," (Joshua 8:30–34).

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me. * * * Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image. * * * Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain. * * * Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy. * * * Honor thy father and thy mother. * * * Thou shalt not kill. * * * Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. * * * Thou shalt not bear false witness. * * * Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house * * * (Exodus 20: 3–17).

"Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God within thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." (Deut. 6: 5.) And thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (Lev. 19: 18.)

The worship of God from the beginning of the nation has been woven into the fabric of the American Republic. Our founding fathers were intellectual giants, steeped in history, philosophy, language, and the Bible, if you please, and guided by a personal faith in God as the Beneficent Providence who was and is the source of life, liberty, and blessing. On March 23, 1775, the year before independence was declared by the American colonies, Patrick Henry delivered his famous address on *American Liberty*. Note these excerpts:

"This is no time for ceremony. The question before the House is one of awful moment to this country. For my own part I consider it as nothing less than a question of freedom or slavery." . . . "Three millions of people, armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in such a country as that which we possess, are invincible by any force which our enemy can send against us. Besides, sir, we shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of the nations; and who will raise up friends to fight our battles for us. The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave. Besides, sir, we have no election. If we were base enough to desire it, it is now too late to retire from the contest. There is no retreat, but in submission and slavery! Our chains are forged! Their clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston! The war is inevitable—and let it come! I repeat, sir, let it come! It is in vain, sir, to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry peace, peace—but there is no peace. The war is actually begun! The next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms! Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death!"

Little more than a year later on July 4, 1776, came the Declaration of Independence in Congress. The purpose of the declaration was set forth in the Preamble. "When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to separation. We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

The ideas of the sovereignty of the people, the equality of citizens, the fundamental rights of all, were just as revolutionary as the break with Britain. It required twelve years for the drafting and the ratification of the Constitution of the United States. Its high purpose was stated clearly in the Preamble, "We the people of the United States in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." It was signed September 17, 1787.

Immediately men of political and spiritual stature called for amendments guaranteeing personal and religious liberties. So, in 1791 the first ten amendments, "A Bill of Rights", were adopted. The First Amendment reads, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." If you could ask the members of that 1791 Congress who was responsible for the American "Bill of Rights" they would in one voice answer, James Madison. But if you could ask James Madison who was responsible for the American "Bill of Rights" he would answer, "A Baptist preacher named John Leland." Throughout our history Baptists have stood for religious liberty for *all* men of every creed, and today we reaffirm our faith in the Bible, the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, the Constitution as a whole and our belief in the right of every man to worship God in a free conscience even if we do not agree with him.

In times of national crisis our people have drawn deeply from the wells of religious faith. The worst threat to the unity and peace of the nation came with the War between the States over the question of slavery. In 1862 while the Civil War was in progress four dignitaries stood on the street just outside the City of Washington, D.C. watching a group of soldiers marching by on their way to the battle front. As they marched they were singing, "John Brown's Body". The four people watching were the Governor of Massachusetts, Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, her husband, and her pastor. Impressed by the scene, the pastor said, "Mrs. Howe, why don't you write some decent words to that stirring tune?" That night Julia Howe was restless. She got up out of her sleepless bed, picked up an old stub of a pen, and with an inspired hand began to write:

"Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord;
He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored;
He hath loosed the fateful lightning of His terrible swift sword;
His truth is marching on.

In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea,
With a glory in His bosom that transfigures you and me;
As he died to make men holy, let us die to make men free,
While God is marching on."

With a nation on its knees the classic statement of America's faith in democracy fell from the lips of Lincoln at Gettysburg. "Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

A charter of democracy could be written from statements of the nation's presidents. In his first Inaugural Address George Washington said, "No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of men more than those of the United States. Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency . . . . . the preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered, perhaps, as deeply, as finally, staked on the experiment intrusted to the hands of the American people."

John Adams in a message to the Senate said, "In a humble reliance on Divine Providence we may rest assured that . . . the independence of our country cannot be diminished, its dignity degraded, or its glory tarnished by any nation or combination of nations, whether friends or enemies." In his Second Inaugural Address Thomas Jefferson said, "I shall need, too, the favor of the Being in whose hands we are, who led our fathers, as Israel of old, from their native land and planted them in a country flowering with all the necessities and comforts of life; who has covered our infancy with His Providence and our riper years with His wisdom and power, and to whose goodness I ask you to join in supplication with me that He will so enlighten the minds of your servants, guide their councils, and prosper their measures that whatsoever they do shall result in your good, and shall secure to you the peace, friendship and approbation of all nations."

Our fourth President, James Madison said to Congress, "The contest in which the United States are engaged appeals for its support to every motive than can animate an uncorrupted and enlightened people—to the love of country; to the pride of liberty; . . . and, finally, to the sacred obligation of transmitting entire to future generations that precious patrimony of national rights and independence which is held in trust by the present from the goodness of Divine Providence."

In his farewell address in 1837 Andrew Jackson declared, "You have the highest human traits committed to your care. Providence has showered on this favored land blessings without number, and has chosen you as the guardians of freedom, to preserve it for the benefits of the human race." In 1863 Lincoln proclaimed, "And whereas it is the duty of nations as well as of men, . . . to recognize the sublime truth, announced in the Holy Scriptures and proven by all history, that those nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord. . . . But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us, and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us."

Now we can see that the pattern of the past is clear. Political principle and religious faith are met in the souls of high statesmen. Liberty and personal faith in God go hand in hand. That first Independence Day was celebrated because men dared to dream, to believe, to struggle, to fight. To keep liberty in America each new generation must envision its possibilities, relift its burdens, refight its battles, face again its conflicts and pay once more its price. May it be our firm resolve to lead all men to Jesus Christ who is the source of all true liberty and who said, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

Address of Vice President Humphrey at Michigan State University Commencement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point in the Record to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the remarks made by Vice President Humphrey at the recent commencement at Michigan State University. He congratulated American youth, our greatest natural resource, and encouraged them, while being mindful of the lessons of history and past traditions, to have the will to do and the soul to dare for the future challenges and responsibilities of this great country.

The text of the address follows:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey at Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich., June 12, 1966

Hubert Humphrey feels a kinship with college students.

I like to be where the action is.

I was raising Cain with the system before you were born, and as I am just beginning to get started, I don't doubt that I will be raising Cain when you are running things too.

In fact, I wish I were being graduated today. I might have a better idea where my next job is coming from.

Today I speak in a relatively new role. I speak for management.

As management's spokesman, I wish first to thank you for service to your nation.

In all these years of study, I am sure you thought you were improving your position to compete in the years ahead or to enter a profession. But you today are more than college graduates.

From management's viewpoint, you are valuable national resources.

More Americans are in college this year than all the Americans alive when our nation was founded. More Americans are in graduate schools today than all the Americans who bore arms during the Revolution. Those are lots of resources.

And we will need them all.

For by the time one of you is likely to stand in this place at some future Commencement, the American people will number more than 300 million—and the people in the world almost too many to even think about.

And I need not recite for you the future needs and problems of those people.

You will be in charge. You will be responsible for our national security and my medicare.

You will be responsible for the education of my grandchildren and the freedom of my great-grandchildren.

So I propose to take a look at you and have a talk with you.

But first, about your parents—it may be hard to believe but, in another century's history books, the very people who have been helping with your tuition may be ranked among the greatest radicals in modern history.

Some of your parents might flinch if you told them there were radicals in your family. But they have been nothing less.

Theirs is the first generation in all of history which, by its own hand, has surrendered the privilege of telling its offspring: This is how things are; this is how they always have been; this is the way the world goes.

Your fathers and mothers were born children of hills and valleys. Today they see the galaxy itself.

They have created amazing new systems of management, science and technology. They have found new and better systems to care for people. And I have been right in the midst of it with them, just as I am with you.

I am not going to bore you with tales of the Great Depression, or of World Wars, and of the hardships your parents faced. Nor will I recount the struggles that took place in our country to achieve the measure of well-being and social justice we have reached today.

But I can tell you, it has been no picnic. It has been no improvised "happening." It has taken involvement, and hard work, and study, and self-doubt, and passionate disagreement, and finally, understanding and motion.

Progress has ridden no fast express. It has been a local all the way. Thus, as older generations welcome you aboard, I think you ought to know that they've not been cooling their heels waiting for you.

The generation of your parents has lived amid the floodwaters of history. Most of them have known genuine hardship. Many of them have lost loved ones on other continents. Their old horizons have gone far off in space, yet they have followed, cautious but willing. The world has come to their dinner table, and at times has seemed to stay a long while, yet they remain hospitable.

They have made history. Yet to many of you, I know, it seems "the heavy hand of history." Remember this: The challenges they have faced didn't leave room for some of the niceties of today.

They have had to meet trouble in large sizes. They have had to feed and clothe and house and transport and produce and educate and struggle in big portions, just to overcome the clear and present perils of their time.

Individualism has been the backbone and concern of their work. Yet to serve the individual, they have had to build on a scale which has seemed at times to dwarf the individual. By and large they have been, I believe, a resourceful and courageous generation. And now, to you, I know, it seems they have hidden their history. Over the battlefield they have laid out the golf course.

For those of you who have grown up within putting distance of a country club or within walking distance of a second car, it is hard, I know, to recognize many vestiges of radicalism. "Where's the action?" you ask. And I reply: There's plenty of action. Roll up your sleeves and have some.

Your parents had to fight desperately, at your age, to stave off poverty at home and violence abroad—and they in large part succeeded.

Yet the challenges you face are far greater, and far more exciting, than those they faced. The scale of effort to be required of you will be far greater than that required of them.

For the fact of our time is this: The poverty our nation knew in the Great Depression . . . the peril that mankind knew in World War II—these are nothing compared to the poverty and peril that surround our strong, rich America in the world today.

There are desperate conditions of injustice and hunger and disease throughout most of the human family.

There are, in human society, conditions which not only bring a sense of shame and insufficiency to those of us who live in such a blessed land . . . but conditions which can lead to the eruption of the little disorder, which can grow to the small war, which can build to the cataclysm which could destroy rich and poor, black and white, believer and non-believer—all of us alike.

That is where the action is.

This is the environment in which you will be in charge. This is the human adventure on which you embark. I believe you sense the full measure of what you face. I feel a sense of concern and of involvement among you. I have seen you in the Peace Corps, helping strangers. I have seen you marching down dusty roads on behalf of fellow Americans whose skin doesn't happen to be white. I have seen you, in VISTA, lifting the forgotten to a place of self-respect in life. I have seen you, standing calm, resisting the temptation of violence, for what you believe in.

I have seen you, wearing your nation's uniform, fighting bravely for a cause far more difficult to understand than any we have defended before. I have seen you speaking out, from deep personal conscience, without thought of personal popularity. You perform remarkably well in the system your parents built, yet I know that you are probing relentlessly to find your own personal relationship to it . . . desperately seeking identity in a society of bigness.

For your generation, the old labels seem to have little meaning. Whether you are part of the "New Left" or the "New Right" or the "Out" or the "In," your concerns are far more for basic humanity than they are political. And I think it is a mistake to see in either your protests, your reservations, or your dissent, much than can fit into the traditional political categories.

Indeed, if much of our political history seems to have escaped you, you are not too troubled by the loss. You are deeply and personally caught up in what matters today. You set high standards for yourselves, and you judge yourselves harshly. And you show a remarkable degree of serious introspection for the children of prosperity. And I sometimes fear that, in your introspection, you may come to believe you are alone.

I tell you now that when you stand alone, you are not alone. When you speak out and act alone in America, you are more a part of this land and more a source of its strength than are all of the multitude who join in silence, no matter how vast they may seem. "The most dangerous enemy to truth and freedom amongst us," said Ibsen, "is the compact majority." Oppose that compact majority, and you are sure to collect a few bruises. But I have found that the best remedy for a bruise is to collect a few more.

The more you speak out, and the more you act, the more you are going to discover that you are lending courage to a surprising number of people whose feelings will come to the surface in response to yours.

True freedom in any land is a relentless, never ending process of self-discovery among its people. This you will preserve, for our own land, not because it is your inheritance; nor because some destiny says you must; but because your own free search for individual identity in the living present, demands it.

The strongest bulwark of liberty is man, free and in search of himself. A good number of your generation have already learned this lesson, in search of themselves in places and causes far distant from East Lansing, Michigan.

It is your opportunity to carry that lesson into forgotten corners of our country—and of the world—where people have never had any reason to learn it, or believe it.

We face today the incomparable opportunity—in the red dust of South American villages, in the neon minefield that is Watts, California—to stimulate the will to seek identity and to discover one's course.

You will be tempted to chart your progress by Gross National Product or by trade indices, or by many other of the quantitative measures you so distrust today.

Keep your distrust of these things. Measure your progress by whether those you help—those who have known in their lives nothing but despair and defeat—by whether they can begin to have faith, by whether they can begin to have hope, by whether they can begin to find themselves.

Yours is the opportunity to prove in the world what the generation of your parents has already begun to prove in America: That the course of history is not a mindless juggernaut we are powerless to control, but a fresh challenge susceptible to courageous action in each generation. I hope you will be sensitive to that opportunity. I hope you will waste no time in seizing it.

The story is told that Pericles of Ancient Greece in his later years came across a young lawyer of Athens who was deeply devoted to causes, who wished to change immediately what was wrong in the world. Pericles chastized the young man for being too bold and brash—for concerning himself with things better left to older men. The older man patronizingly said: "Of course, I understand for I, too, was overeager in my youth. But now that I am older I have learned better. Take my advice and do not become so involved." To which the young man replied: "I regret I did not have the privilege of knowing you when you were at your best."

Despite the fact that I represent management here today, I will tell you this: If you do not choose to follow, precisely the trails that others have blazed, then I do not think we ought to count the future unsafe in your hands.

In your search for identity and self-knowledge, you will have much to discover before you determine what is worthwhile, and what is worthless. But in a land of individuals, better the mystery of the search than some counterfeit security. In a world society desperate for change, better your dedication to it than your fear of it.

It is the special blessing of this land, that each generation of Americans has called its own cadence, and written its own music—and our greatest songs are still unsung.

Tax Inequality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the retail tire business has operated over the years with an inherent inequality that favors one particular type of dealer, the manufacturer-owned store. These dealers have been permitted to avoid paying an excise tax when the tire has been sold, while the independent seller has had to pay such a tax when he purchases tires from the manufacturer. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 566, which would offer at least a partial solution to this inequity.

I would like to commend to the attention of our colleagues a letter addressed to me by my good friend, George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, and the accompanying articles which concern my bill and the situation it seeks to correct.

Mr. Burger's letter follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., July 7, 1966.

Re H.R. 566.
Hon. ABRAHAM MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: Let it be stated for the record that during your membership on the House Small Business Committee, your actions in behalf of small business have spoken louder than words. I am referring to your splendid leadership both in the Committee on Small Business and the House Banking Committee to bring into existence, by law, a strong Small Business Administration and more recently a major correction in that Agency, placing the power in the hands of the Administrator, eliminating any control of the loan policy from the Treasury and the Department of Commerce. Then again, your continuing action in behalf of small business when you introduced the above bill and similar bills in the preceding Congress that would prohibit tire manufacturers owning and operating retail stores in competition, not alone with their own independents but all other independents in the rubber tire industry.

During the life of this proposed legislation (1942), to the credit of the then Senate Small Business Committee headed by the late Senator Murray, followed shortly thereafter by the action of the Senate Banking Committee then headed by the late Senator Robert Wagner—in both instances the Committees reported the legislation out unanimously.

It has been reported that the late Senator Taft, a member of both the Senate Small Business Committee and the Senate Banking Committee remarked on two occasions that "sooner or later Congress would have to approve such legislation." In other words, a pattern as being set to curb other major producers in other industries to enter into dual distribution. It is to be noted that now the same situation is facing independent retailers in the men's apparel field.

It is a matter of record as early as 1942, concerning concessions enjoyed by these major tire manufacturers operating retail stores nationwide where stocks of tires and tubes in these stores have been exempt of the excise tax until sold to the ultimate buyer, right up to the present moment.

To the credit of the House Small Business Committee early in 1942, by unanimous action, they recommended to Ways and Means and to the Secretary of the Treasury correction be made of this rank tax discrimination.

In the First Session of the present Congress, for the third time the Ways and Means Committee of the House, by legislative action, recommended the adoption of such legislation.

To the credit of the Ways and Means Committee they have repeatedly voted out legislation unanimously to the floor of the House and in two instances, it was unanimously approved by the House.

On June 21, 1966, the Senate Finance Committee held public hearings on H.R. 318. This was the bill that was unanimously voted by the House in the First Session of the present Congress.

The Ways and Means Committee in its reports, estimated that at least a $3 million saving was accruing through these major tire manufacturers operating retail stores—that is, deferring any tax payment to the Government until their stocks of tires are finally sold. The Ways and Means Committee also stated that at least 15% of the total cost of the inventory of tires and tubes in the hands of independent dealers nationwide was tied up in advance excise tax to the Federal Government whereas they stated the manufacturers' retail stores stocks were exempt. I am attaching herewith a report that appeared in the Akron Beacon Journal on June 22, which is self-explanatory.

It's hard to believe that the Treasury Department would oppose any action that would bring in increased revenue to the Federal Government. It is self-evident the power exercised by these tire manufacturers must be far-reaching in destroying the business life of independent retailers in the rubber tire industry.

Finally, it is self-evident that your bill is a major move setting a pattern that would prevent the increasing monopolistic trends by major producers to monopolise all branches of the retail field.

It is my hope and trust for the overall good of small business that you might find it convenient to insert this communication in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Again, Congressman MULTER, you are to be complimented for your sincere efforts in behalf of small business.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Enclosures.

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, June 22, 1966]

TIRE TAX SPEEDUP NOT WORTH IT, TREASURY SAYS

(By Philip Meyer)

WASHINGTON.—The Treasury Department Tuesday asked the Senate to forget about a proposed speedup in tire excise tax collections.

Even though the move would bring the Treasury from $5 million to $12 million, it wouldn't be worth the trouble, said Lawrence M. Stone, the department's tax legislative counsel.

Stone and spokesmen for the tire industry testified before the Senate Finance Committee.

"I take it," said Sen. CLINTON ANDERSON (D-N.M.), "that you are strongly opposed to the bill."

"I wouldn't use the word 'strongly'," replied Stone. "We're opposed to it. But it's not a matter of life or death."

The Rubber Manufacturers' Association (RMA) is strongly opposed. Patrick J. Moran, chief tax counsel for General Tire, said the bill would place "an additional financial burden on the tire manufacturers and an unnecessary administrative burden on the Internal Revenue Service."

Pressure for the bill comes from independent tire dealers, represented at the hearings by George Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

Burger said the present system of tax collection is unfair to the independents.

He figures it this way:

The 10-cent a pound tax is collected when the tire is sold. For the independent dealer, this comes when he buys the tire from the manufacturer. But for the manufacturer-owned store, there is no sale until the retail customer gets the tire.

The proposed bill, which passed the House last year, would equalize matters by collecting from company stores when they receive the tires from the plant.

The present system gives company stores an unfair advantage, Burger said, because independent dealers must "maintain continuing sizable investments in prepaid Federal taxes" on their inventory.

But the Treasury Department and the RMA said the inequity is not as great as Burger pictures it.

The average tire dealer turns over his stock every 95 days and pays the manufacturer 86 days after delivery. This means, he said, that the dealer carries a tax-paid inventory for only nine days.

His only loss, said Stone, is the interest he could have earned for nine days on money tied up in taxes. It figures out, he said, to about 1¼ cents a month for each tire.

The price of wiping out this small inequity would be a confusing new system of tax rolls, he said.

The proposed change got this far only by accident. It passed the House under suspension of the rules, a procedure reserved for non-controversial bills.

Rep. WILLIAM AYRES of Akron was present at the time and intended to declare the bill controversial. But he was called to the phone just before the bill was called up and missed his chance.

The EDITOR,
Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.:

Front page Wall Street Journal today says that "Independent tire dealers try to persuade Congress to exempt them from having to pay excise tax on tire stocks at the time they are purchased from the manufacturer." This is not true as the record will show in Congressional hearings on the subject matter for nearly a quarter of a century tire dealers have requested that the stocks of tires and tubes in manufacturers' retail stores be taxed in the same manner and form as the independent tire dealers are subject to. What they are requesting in simple words is equal justice under the law. As a benefit to all of your readers, will you make this correction?

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington, D.C.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 29, 1966]

Independent tire dealers strive to persuade Congress to exempt them from having to pay excise taxes on tire stocks at the time of purchase from the manufacturers. The independent dealers maintain that the tax law discriminates against them because retail outlets owned by the tire makers aren't required to pay excise levies until tires are sold; under present law, such intra-company transactions don't count as sales. Congressional tax-writing committees seem sympathetic to the independent tire sellers' plea, but Treasury opposition may block a bill that would give them relief. The Treasury argues that changing the rules for non-affiliated tire dealers would prompt similar pleas from other independent retailers, such as truck dealers, who also must pay excise taxes in advance, leading to "administrative and compliance problems."

Wall Street Journal made the correction on July 1, 1966, and advised me accordingly.

We Need a Nuclear Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as I said on the floor of the House on Tuesday of this week, during the consideration of the conference report on S. 2950, the military procurement authorization bill, "We need a nuclear Navy, and we had better get it."

Mr. Louis Stockstill, editor of the Journal of the Armed Forces, has written an excellent editorial dealing with our need for a nuclear Navy. The editorial, which appears in the July 9, 1966, issue of the Journal, follows:

WE NEED A NUCLEAR NAVY

(By Louis Stockstill)

The development of a nuclear-powered surface Navy may hinge on the Administration's reaction to an important proviso which has been appended to the fiscal 1967 military procurement authorization bill.

Just before Congress departed Washington for a 10-day summer recess, House and Senate conferees agreed to language in the $17-billion procurement bill which provides that $130.5-million of the funds available for Naval shipbuilding in the current fiscal year "is authorized only" for the construction of a nuclear powered guided missile frigate (authorized last year) and $20-million "is authorized only" for procurement of long lead-time items for an additional nuclear frigate.

The proviso stipulates that the contract for the frigate authorized last year "shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that its construction is not in the national interest."

By refusing to build the first of the two frigates and by rejecting a Navy request for funds for the second such ship (even though it was accorded the second-highest priority in the overall shipbuilding program by the Chief of Naval Operations), the Department of Defense acted on the basis of cost-effectiveness studies which the Navy has challenged and, we think, discounted. Obviously, Congress agrees.

In turning down the Navy requests, Secretary of Defense McNamara initially contended that he had never been furnished with an adequate Navy rationale for nuclear power in escort vessels. Subsequently, however, CNO Admiral David McDonald presented the Secretary with a comprehensive memorandum on the subject which made some hardhitting points.

The data in the McDonald memorandum showed that for a one-third increase in overall cost the Navy could obtain a nuclear frigate (instead of a conventional destroyer) which would have (1) twice the number of missile launchers and missile magazines, (2) helicopter landing facilities not available on the destroyer, (3) facilities and accommodations for a screen commander, which the destroyer does not have, (4) more complete Naval Tactical Data System facilities, (5) twice as many torpedo tubes, and (6) all the advantages of nuclear power.

Admiral H. G. Rickover pointed out in his Congressional testimony on the subject that fuel also was an important cost-comparison factor discussed in the CNO memorandum. The initial nuclear cores for two frigates (good for ten years) would cost $24-million. Regular fuel for two conventional destroyers for the same time period would cost $12-million, but an additional $26-million would have to be expended on delivery of the oil.

We feel that the Navy has made a solid case, particularly in light of the statement in Admiral McDonald's memorandum that "The endurance, tactical flexibility, and greater freedom from logistics support of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled Naval striking force. Our new warships, which the Navy will be operating into the 21st century, should be provided with the most modern propulsion plants available. To do less is to degrade effectiveness with grave implications for national security."

Right Words; Wrong War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, from time to time it is necessary to correct deliberate historical distortions, and one of the latest of such departures from reality made by former President Harry Truman was effectively discussed in the July 10 edition of the Chicago Tribune. I insert it in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

RIGHT WORDS; WRONG WAR

The changes are Harry S. Truman never recognized the incongruity of his own words in a Fourth of July speech at Independence, Mo. Speaking of the Johnson administration's belated decision to bomb the vital communist oil depots near Hanoi and Haiphong in North Viet Nam, Truman said, "They finally awakened to the fact that they have got to win the war and I'm glad they are going ahead to do it."

Sixteen years ago another American commander, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, sought to win another war in Asia after the Chinese Communists poured across the Yalu river from Manchuria into North Korea. He sought permission to knock out the source of their strength by bombing the Chinese industrial sanctuary in Manchuria, and by driving the Chinese ground forces back to the Yalu. His boss, President Truman, said, "No."

The United Nations, in whose name ostensibly the communist aggression in Korea was being resisted, flew into a tizzy of apprehension that MacArthur's bombing of the Chinese Reds would bring their Russian pals into action and launch World War III. Led by Great Britain, the U.N. turned its pressure on Truman, who ordered MacArthur to hold back. The United States would not bring its full power to bear for victory.

Manchuria was not bombed. MacArthur was fired and the Americans, with their South Korean allies and U.N. troops, were finally halted along the 38th parallel. Korea remained divided. Instead of victory there is an inconclusive armistice that persists to this day while the United States fights the same communist aggression in southeast Asia.

Had President Truman followed in 1950 the "win the war" advice he uttered in 1966, the Korean war might well have ended in victory instead of stalemate. The words at Independence sound remarkably like the advice of the man Truman relieved of command in Korea: "There is no substitute for victory."

Australia Stands With Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Harold Holt of Australia continues to speak out in favor of our action in South Vietnam.

In so doing, Mr. Holt attests once again to the friendship and unity of interest between our two countries.

The Chicago Tribune comments approvingly on Mr. Holt's statement in London urging NATO nations to play a more positive role in freedom's defense in southeast Asia. He recognizes, the newspaper states, that the struggle to resist Communist aggression is indivisible.

So it is—and in paying my respects to the Prime Minister, I insert the Tribune editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, July 8, 1966]

ONE ALLY WHICH STANDS WITH US

Prime Minister Harold Holt of Australia, who visited Washington to express his country's support of the United States in the war in Viet Nam, spoke from London yesterday to America's laggard allies in western Europe. He called upon France and other members of the NATO alliance to play a more positive role in the far east and southeast Asia.

He said that the United States deserved a return for American support in two world wars that began in Europe, criticizing French hostility to America's efforts in Viet Nam and the disposition of other European nations to "coast along" on the struggle and sacrifice of the United States.

The United States, he said, is carrying out a task of value to the free world as a whole. He added that America was justifiably disappointed that it had been given so little support, "when in principle they find, as we find, it is hard to distinguish between the issues arising in South Viet Nam and those in West Berlin."

Australia, with South Korea and New Zealand, has sent troops to Viet Nam. It is encouraging to find one ally which is willing to stand with us not only in principle but with tangible support. Prime Minister Holt recognizes, as any realistic statesman should, that the struggle to resist comunist aggression is indivisible. Freedom cannot be compartmented, and battles in Asia may yet be what saves Europe.

The Colorado River Issue—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the editorial page of this morning's Washington Post—June 14—carried some commonsense thoughts about the current Colorado River issue now before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I place the editorial in the RECORD for the consideration of Members of Congress:

COLORADO RIVER ISSUE

Debate began yesterday in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on one of the most important bills before Congress this year—the measure to authorize the Central Arizona Project. It is vital to the 30 million people of the seven states in the Colorado River Basin. Indeed the entire country will be affected by the outcome because of the great national interest in the Grand Canyon of the Colorado.

The Committee will have to weigh two major objectives. The Colorado Basin states are clamoring for this final step in harnessing the great river as an essential elment of their continued growth. Indeed, they insist that they cannot survive without additional water. With rare unanimity, they are asking Congress to authorize a project that will divert 1.2 million acre-feet of water each year to the parched and thirsty areas around Phoenix and Tucson.

The Upper Basin states are supporting this undertaking only because the bill would also authorize five new water projects in Colorado at a cost of $361 million and a study of 13 other Upper Basin projects. In the picture is the further hope of importing water for the semi-arid Southwest, to be financed at least in part by power revenues to be derived from the proposed dams at Bridge and Marble Canyons, Representative MORRIS K. UDALL of Arizona recently held out hope that about $3 billion will be left in the basin fund "to help solve the larger water problems of the seven basin states."

The project unfortunately comes into collision with the passionate desire of many conservation groups to avoid any further obstruction of the picturesque Colorado. Ignoring or playing down the water problem, they cry out against the "ruin of the Grand Canyon." The Sierra Club and a number of Congressmen are asking Congress, not only to defeat the proposed Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams, but also greatly to extend the existing Grand Canyon National Park.

To our way of thinking, the answer must necessarily lie somewhere between the two extremes. The inescapable fact is that harnessing of the Colorado has been essential to the burgeoning of the Southwest. It could not support its present population without the impoundments of water behind immense dams (Hoover, Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge and others). There is no doubt a compelling logic to completion of the system with due regard for scenic and recreational values as well as economic advantages.

We think that Congress will recognize this logic and pass some measure authorizing the Central Arizona Project. At the same time it is under obligation to this and future generations to minimize the impact upon the natural beauty of the Colorado River. Any grave encroachment upon the Grand Canyon National Park itself would be unthinkable, and even the change of the river into a lake for 13 miles at the western end of the park by the Bridge Canyon Dam ought to be avoided if possible.

While earnestly seeking an alternative, however, it is plain nonsense to speak of this proposed minor change in the park as ruining the Grand Canyon. It would not alter the awesome sight that visitors in the National Park see. The 175-mile Lake Powell behind Glen Canyon Dam has demonstrated, moreover, that stored water in the desolate Southwest can in some cases add greatly to recreational values.

We hope that Congress, in moving to utilize the full potential of the Colorado for the people, will give due weight to scenic and recreational values. Numerous suggestions for a compromise between the demands for water and the demands for preservation of natural beauty have been made. One is elimination of the proposed Marble Canyon Dam and the addition of this gorge to Grand Canyon National Park. Another is reduction of the height of Bridge Canyon Dam so as to avoid any water storage in the park and reduction of the flooding in the Grand Canyon National Monument.

There are various other proposals for enlargement of Grand Canyon National Park by the inclusion of sections of the Kaibab Game Reserve, the Kaibab National Forest and the National Monument. Congress could soften the impact of whatever it finds necessary to do to meet the water problem of the Southwest by adding to the remarkable complex of scenic and recreational preserves in the area.

Mr. Abraham Kofman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, members of the so-called fourth estate very often directly serve the public anonymously due to their own innate modesty of not wanting to extol their own virtues and due to the competitive nature of the newspaper business where rival interests would not want to give appropriate recognition.

One of the members of the fourth estate who is doing an outstanding job not only in publishing newspapers but in serving the people of California on the State highway commission is Mr. Abraham "Abe" Kofman, of Alameda, Calif.

Recently, the California State Legislature adopted a resolution commending Mr. Kofman upon the outstanding administrative services in journalistic contributions he has given to the people of California and to his community. In view of this action, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper clipping which appeared in the San Leandro Morning News commenting on this fine honor:

KOFMAN HONORED FOR SERVICE TO PEOPLE OF STATE, COMMUNITY

SACRAMENTO.—The State Assembly has honored Abraham Kofman, publisher of the Alameda Times-Star, the San Leandro Morning News and the Fremont News-Register for his recent election for a second time as vice chairman of the California Highway Commission.

The commission is responsible for selecting routes for all state highways and freeways and also has sole authority for adopting a budget for highway construction. The budget amounts to nearly $700 million a year, including state and federal funds.

The Assembly adopted HR 452 by Assemblyman Robert W. Crown, D-Alameda, which resolved that the Assembly "command and congratulate Mr. Abraham (Abe) Kofman upon his election as vice chairman of the California Highway Commission and upon the outstanding adminstrative services and journalistic contributions he has given to the people of the State of California and his community."

Kofman first was appointed to the commission in September 1961 and was reappointed to a four-year term in January 1964. He was elected vice chairman of the commission in 1964 and again in 1966.

Long Wharf Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Council of the Arts awarded the Long Wharf Theater in New Haven, Conn., a $50,000 grant. I would like to tell you about some of the unique innovations which the theater has instituted.

The Long Wharf Theater is a year-round, professional repertory company. It could be called an experimental theater. The distance between the play and the audience has been eliminated, not only by abolishing the proscenium arch, but also by conducting seminars after the performances, by discussions between the actors and the audience, and by free workshop productions.

In addition to the regular performances, Long Wharf has several special programs. These special programs enable people who ordinarily would have no contact with the theater, to acquire an appreciation and an understanding of the theater.

Young people have benefited especially from the programs at Long Wharf. The high school program brings the theater to the students and the students to the theater. Since October, the touring company has visited 33 schools. During the same time, 17,000 students from 110 schools and 75 towns in Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New York have taken advantage of reduced student rates to preview regular performances. The Children's Theater presents plays which have been written especially for children. Disadvantaged students in all grades are able to attend productions by means of grants.

The experimental programs also reach two adult groups which have limited incomes. Grants have been established so that the elderly and the members of the adult literacy classes might attend theater performances.

The grant from the National Council of the Arts has helped make these innovations possible. It has enabled the theater to develop independently its unique cultural services and it has enabled Americans from all walks of life to understand and to enjoy the performing arts.

Many of the successes of the Long Wharf project and the recognition given it by the National Council prove the validity of the establishment of this council. Such work as Long Wharf's should clearly be supported, and I am proud to bring it to the attention of the Congress.

Terror and Persecution in Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, next week we will commemorate Captive Nations Week, and in the face of continued State Department hopes that Moscow is "mellowing" we find new evidence of Communist oppression of the captive peoples. I insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the May edition of the Ukrainian Bulletin which eloquently tells the story of the latest persecution of anti-Communist nationalists in the Ukraine:

NEW TERROR AND PERSECUTION IN UKRAINE

While Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko was recently being received by Pope Paul VI at the Vatican, the Kremlin was unleashing a new wave of terror and persecution in Ukraine. Frank admissions in Moscow and Kiev that in Ukraine anti-Soviet rumblings and unrest are widespread, especially among the youth, testify conclusively to the fact that the Ukrainian people are more restive than ever and that they resent and oppose the despicable and hated Communist rule imposed upon them by Moscow.

This renewed persecution of the Ukrainians by their Russian Communist masters is well-coordinated and centrally-directed, and is pressed forward under diverse forms and aspects. On March 28, 1966, for example, the Associated Press reported that 8 Ukrainians were sentenced to death for alleged collaboration with the Germans in Ukraine some twenty-five years ago. On another front, Moscow is ranting against Western radio broadcasts, which admittedly have a strong impact upon the Ukrainian people, especially the youth. Finally, Moscow has been arresting a number of Ukrainian writers, poets and literary critics for their espousal of non-Communist ideology or simply for their critical views of Communism and the totalitarian system in general.

EFFECT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL WEAPON

For almost two decades this publication has been steadily campaigning for effective and enlightened broadcasts to Ukraine and other non-Russian nations, held captive by Moscow in the USSR. We have been pointing out that the communist rule of Moscow is extremely vulnerable to the ideas of freedom and liberation. We have urged a stronger "Voice of America," and the improvement of its broadcasts to Ukraine. A few years ago, when the broadcasts in the non-Russian languages of the "Voice of America" were threatened with elimination, we protested with all the vigor at our command against the short-sighted and craven policy-makers who would have cut out these broadcasts on the insipid pretext that the U.S. government had no adequate transmitters to continue these vital broadcasts.

To be pointed out is that the necessity of the Ukrainian-language radio broadcasts to Ukraine is recognized by other instrumentalities. There is "Radio Liberty," a private U.S. group (which operates far more effectively than the "Voice of America"), the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), the Spanish Radio Nacional de Espagna, the Italian government's Foreign Ministry and the Vatican Radio. (The British Broadcasting Corporation, surprisingly, balks at installing Ukrainian-language broadcasts on the ground that "everybody in the USSR understands the Russian language." The obvious benefit of communicating with a people in their own language needs no comment.)

The effectiveness of all this direct communication with the enslaved nations is now to be measured by the reaction in Moscow. The position over the years of this publication, as well as that of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, is fully vindicated.

FURIOUS REACTION IN UKRAINE

On March 25, 1966, The New York Times reported that Communist party leaders throughout the USSR are expressing concern about the influence exerted by the Western radio broadcasts upon ordinary Soviet citizens, especially those in the non-Russian republics.

Significantly, while there is a revolt among Russian intellectuals against the Party conformism and dictation, it is in Ukraine, the Baltic countries, Byelorussia, Georgia and Armenia that these broadcasts are making their most telling impact.

In Ukraine, two top-notch Communist leaders have denounced the Western psychological warfare weapons and admitted that they are making deep inroads in Ukraine.

These apprehensions of the Soviet leadership were voiced at a series of republic party congresses held in March, 1966. They suggest that Soviet ideological indoctrination is being seriously undermined by this exposure to non-Communist ideas and news.

For instance, Peter Shelest, secretary general of the Communist Party of Ukraine and a member of the ruling Politburo of the USSR, said at the Ukrainian party congress:

"The poisonous seeds of bourgeois ideology are hitting us through various channels. Every day tens of enemy radio stations broadcast for many hours against Ukraine.

"There are individuals who become conductors of opinions alien to us. Our society cannot reconcile itself to these people who continue to spread the rumors, gossip and inventions from the hostile press and radio."

Another top-ranking Ukrainian Communist, playwright Alexander Korneichuk, stated at the same party gathering:

"Not so long ago American Senators formulated the clear and unequivocal goal of the subversive action against the Soviet Union: to wage propaganda by all available means, not sparing expense. . . You see whither the mad unleashers of war are aiming . . . The sworn enemies have cast many rusted nationalist hooks with rotten worms into the airways: perhaps a fool will come along and swallow it. Unfortunately, they find such fools, who repeat every single lie that is fabricated in West Germany for dollars and marks by the surviving German fascists.

"With such 'young talents' who lose their honor and conscience, who do not respect the great fortune in the world—to belong to the great family of the Soviet nations—there can be only one kind of talk: 'Come to your senses, because if not, you will have to face the people, they might take away your Soviet passports and say, "Get off our sacred land."' "

ARREST OF UKRAINIAN WRITERS

This threat of the Soviet literary commissar in Ukraine was not an idle one. As reported by the New York Times on April 7, 1966, the Soviet secret police arrested two Ukrainian writers, Ivan Svitlychny and Ivan Dzyuba. Their arrests came after the publicized trial of Andrei D. Sinyavsky and Yuli M. Daniel. The Ukrainian writers were accused of having smuggled to the West the Ukrainian nationalist poetry and "bitter" diary of another Ukrainian poet, Vasyl Symonenko, who died in 1963 at the age of 29 of natural causes.

Both poets emerged into prominence in the 1960's as the staunch supporters, defenders and popularizers of a new group of Ukrainian writers whose work is characterized by a humanistic and highly individualistic approach to the problem of man in relation to society and government. Moscow saw them as, above all, true Ukrainian patriots; as such they had to be condemned and removed from their native land.

ASSAIL UKRAINIANS IN FREE WORLD

Finally, on April 19, 1966, the Foreign Ministry of the Ukrainian SSR in Kiev staged a press conference at which Communist officials assailed the United States, West Germany and other Western governments, and the Ukrainian nationalists in the free world as well, for their alleged undermining of the Soviet Union. A Ukrainian nationalist defector from Munich was brought to the fore as proof that the insidious design of the United States is to smash the USSR, for the defector, Stepan Dzugalo, reportedly stated that the United States and British intelligence services were financing all the activities of the Ukrainians in the free world!

All the attacks on the Ukrainians in the free and enslaved worlds demonstrate above all one thing: Ukraine is an unsubmissive captive nation whose undying spirit for freedom and independence haunts the Russian totalitarians. The phantom of Ukrainian rebellion is ever-present.

The imperio-colonialistic reaction to this eternal spirit of freedom and decency which dominates the captive Ukrainian people can be only what it is: arrest, terror, persecution and the extirpation of all liberal and humane ideas.

OPPORTUNITY FOR THE WEST

The unrest and rumblings in Ukraine offer a new opportunity for the West generally, and the United States particularly, to recognize and capitalize upon the importance of the captive nations inside the USSR. While we are preoccupied in Vietnam, we tend to neglect or underestimate the Communist enemy which has been planning our destruction relentlessly without respite or change of mind, "peace" talks with the Vatican notwithstanding.

Ukraine has been our ally in the past and it remains one today. A reasonably sound recognition on our part of its claim to freedom and independence would encourage its people to resist even more strongly on the side of freedom and against the forces of bleak totalitarian ruthlessness which the Kremlin represents today and in the future.

The Kremlin's unwilling confession of its failure in Ukraine represents a great hope not only for the brave Ukrainian people, but for the friends of freedom everywhere.

Colorado River Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to the excellent editorial "Colorado River Issue" which appeared this morning in the Washington Post. As the editorial points out, "it is plain nonsense" to believe that the construction of the two dams, Marble Canyon, and Bridge Canyon or Hualapai, would in any way ruin the Grand Canyon. No such thought has ever or would ever enter the heads of those who are working so tirelessly for the passage of Colorado River Basin project bill.

I hope this editorial will be read and taken to heart by all those who believe otherwise:

Colorado River Issue

Debate began yesterday in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on one of the most important bills before Congress this year—the measure to authorize the Central Arizona Project. It is vital to the 30 million people of the seven states in the Colorado River Basin. Indeed, the entire country will be affected by the outcome because of the great national interest in the Grand Canyon of the Colorado.

The Committee will have to weigh two major objectives. The Colorado Basin states are clamoring for this final step in harnessing the great river as an essential element of their continued growth. Indeed, they insist that they cannot survive without additional water. With rare unanimity, they are asking Congress to authorize a project that will divert 1.2 million acre-feet of water each year to the parched and thirsty areas around Phoenix and Tucson.

The Upper Basin states are supporting this undertaking only because the bill would also authorize five new water projects in Colorado at a cost of $361 million and a study of 13 other Upper Basin projects. In the picture is the further hope of importing water for the semi-arid Southwest, to be financed at least in part by power revenues to be derived from the proposed dams at Bridge and Marble Canyons. Representative Morris K. Udall of Arizona recently held out hope that about $3 billion will be left in the basin fund "to help solve the larger water problems of the seven basin states."

The project unfortunately comes into collision with the passionate desire of many conservation groups to avoid any further obstruction of the picturesque Colorado. Ignoring or playing down the water problem, they cry out against the "ruin of the Grand Canyon." The Sierra Club and a number of Congressmen are asking Congress, not only to defeat the proposed Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams, but also greatly to extend the existing Grand Canyon National Park.

To our way of thinking, the answer must necessarily lie somewhere between the two extremes. The inescapable fact is that harnessing of the Colorado has been essential to the burgeoning of the Southwest. It could not support its present population without the impoundments of water behind immense dams (Hoover, Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge and others). There is no doubt a compelling logic to completion of the system with due regard for scenic and recreational values as well as economic advantages.

We think that Congress will recognize this logic and pass some measure authorizing the Central Arizona Project. At the same time it is under obligation to this and future generations to minimize the impact upon the natural beauty of the Colorado River. Any grave encroachment upon the Grand Canyon National Park itself would be unthinkable, and even the change of the river into a lake for 13 miles at the western end of the park by the Bridge Canyon Dam ought to be avoided if possible.

While earnestly seeking an alternative, however, it is plain nonsense to speak of this proposed minor change in the park as ruining the Grand Canyon. It would not alter the awesome sight that visitors in the National Park see. The 175-mile Lake Powell behind Glen Canyon Dam has demonstrated, moreover, that stored water in the desolate Southwest in some cases add greatly to recreational values.

We hope that Congress, in moving to utilize the full potential of the Colorado for the people, will give due weight to scenic and recreational values. Numerous suggestions for a compromise between the demands for water and the demands for preservation of natural beauty have been made. One is elimination of the proposed Marble Canyon Dam and the addition of this gorge to Grand Canyon National Park. Another is reduction of the height of Bridge Canyon Dam so as to avoid any water storage in the park and reduction of the flooding in the Grand Canyon National Monument.

There are various other proposals for enlargement of Grand Canyon National Park by the inclusion of sections of the Kaibab Game Reserve, the Kaibab National Forest and the National Monument. Congress could soften the impact of whatever it finds necessary to do to meet the water problem of the Southwest by adding to the remarkable complex of scenic and raecreational preserves in the area.

Letter From Steinbeck to Yevtushenko States Vietnam Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, it sometimes appears that people in the literary field are most critical of the foreign policy decisions made by our Government. Seldom, if ever, is there similar criticism of our opponents. For that reason, I was particularly pleased to see the position of our Nation defended so clearly by a recent letter from John Steinbeck to the Soviet poet Yeogeny Yevtushenko.

This letter appeared in the great daily newspaper Newsday in Nassau County, which is published in my congressional district.

In this letter, Mr. Steinbeck answered a plea by Yevtushenko that the Pulitzer and Nobel Prize winning American novelist speak out on the war in Vietnam. This Mr. Steinbeck did, but not, I am sure, as Mr. Yevtushenko expected.

Mr. Steinbeck wrote his letter not only as a world figure and famous American writer but as a father with a son now fighting in Vietnam.

Mr. Steinbeck's letter follows:

MY DEAR FRIEND GENYA: I have just now read those parts of your poem printed in the New York Times. I have no way of knowing how good the translation is, but I am pleased and flattered by your devotion.

In your poem, you ask me to speak out against the war in Vietnam. You know well how I detest all war, but for this one I have a particular and personal hatred. I am against this Chinese-inspired war. I don't know a single American who is for it. But, my beloved friend, you asked me to denounce half a war, our half. I appeal to you to join me in denouncing the whole war.

Surely you don't believe that our "pilots fly to bomb children," that we send bombs and heavy equipment against innocent civilians? This is not East Berlin in 1953, Budapest in 1956, nor Tibet in 1959.

You know as well as I do, Genya, that we are bombing oil storage, transport and the heavy and sophisticated weapons they carry to kill our sons. And where that oil and those weapons come from, you probably know better than I. They are marked in pictograph and in Cyrilic characters.

I hope you also know that if those weapons were not being sent, we would not be in Vietnam at all. If this were a disagreement between Vietnamese people, we surely would not be there, but it is not, and since I have never found you to be naive you must be aware that it is not.

This war is the work of Chairman Mao, designed and generalled by him in absentia, advised by Peking and cynically supplied with brutal weapons by foreigners who set it up. Let us denounce this also, my friend, but even more, let us together undertake a program more effective than denunciation.

I beg you to use your very considerable influence on your people, your government, and on those who look to the Soviet Union for direction, to stop sending the murderous merchandise through North Vietnam to be used against the South.

For my part, I will devote every resource I have to persuade my government to withdraw troops and weapons from the South, leaving only money and help for rebuilding. And, do you know, Genya, if you could accomplish your part, my part would follow immediately and automatically.

But even this is not necessary to stop the war. If you could persuade North Vietnam to agree in good faith to negotiate, the bombing would stop instantly. The guns would fall silent and our dear sons could come home. It is as simple as that, my friend, as simple as that, I promise you. I hope to see you and your lovely wife Galya soon.

With all respect and affection,

JOHN STEINBECK.

Rogers Lauds President's Enthusiasm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, all of us who have been keenly interested in the future of oceanography were pleased by the enthusiasm shown yesterday by the President at the commissioning of the *Oceanographer*.

The President's call for redoubled efforts in marine science and technology should be a rallying point for our future efforts in ocean research.

As the President pointed out, we have started on this trip into our last frontier, but we still have a long journey. The President's endorsement of oceanography will help speed the journey.

Culver Notes Honor to Cedar Rapids Public Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, today, at the American Library Association Conference in New York City, a well-deserved award is being made to the Cedar Rapids Public Library.

I have personally had the opportunity to use the facilities of the library for a number of years, and I know of the outstanding service which it is providing for the residents of the community, and particularly the young people.

I am pleased and proud that the Library Public Relations Council has awarded first place in a national competition to the Cedar Rapids Library for "the most creative use of illustration in a publication promoting library service."

The Cedar Rapids Gazette has described the award and the publication in some detail, and I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD as evidence of the valuable contribution which is being made by the library director, James C. Marvin, and the highly qualified members of his staff:

CEDAR RAPIDS LIBRARY HONORED FOR PUBLICATIONS

The Cedar Rapids public library has been awarded first place in the Library Public Relations Council competition for "the most creative use of illustration in a publication promoting library service."

Library Director James C. Marvin was notified Monday of the award, to be presented at the American Library Assn. conference in New York on July 14.

The Cedar Rapids library's winning entry was the "Paul Bunyan Parade" summer reading program. It was developed by Children's Librarian Evelyn Zerzanek, Nancy McHugh, publications consultant, and other members of the staff, for use in 1964.

Line drawings by Cedar Rapids artist Jean King provided the basis for the entire program, which was planned to introduce America's legendary heroes and to promote public library service for children.

Miss King's drawings were used extensively throughout the library's 8-page "Paul Bunyan Parade" reading-record booklets; on the companion "Land of Legend and Lore" maps and on the sets of 20 gummed stamps depicting various characters in American folklore, which were to be located in appropriate areas on the map.

The copyrighted publications were given, without charge, to participants in the library's 1964 summer program.

Jean King illustrations have been featured in the library's bulletin board displays and publications for the last 15 years, and are currently to be seen in the "Wonderland" vacation reading program now in progress.

Another Cedar Rapids library publication, "All about Growing Up", received the Library Public Relations Council award in 1963 as "the best library booklist of the year". Illustrations for that pamphlet were by Maurice Sendak, noted illustrator of children's books.

Purpose of the LPRC awards is "to make public recognition of the many fine pieces of publicity which libraries are supplying for their borrowers, through booklets, annual reports and circulars about library affairs".

Harold L. Roth, director of the public library of East Orange, N.J., is chairman of the 1966 awards committee.

Poland Springs Job Corps Training Center for Girls Aims at Reversing "The High Cost of Failure" in the Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Boston Herald in an editorial on June 5, 1966, says that the Job Corps Training Center for Girls in Poland Springs, Maine, "is off to a good start with high morale among both the staffers and the corpsmen." This editorial puts forth extremely well what Poverty Program Director Sargent Shriver has been saying right along:

> If these girls are going to succeed they will need a great deal of help and especially individual help.

I recommend that this editorial be read by my coleagues, so I ask permission to have it printed with my remarks in the Appendix:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Herald, June 5, 1966]

THE HIGH COST OF FAILURE

In her series on the Poland Spring Job Training Center for girls, Herald Reporter Arline Grimes revealed that the estimated cost for educating one girl for one year ranges between $4,000 and $8,000. This sounds terribly high, and it is, higher in fact than the cost of a university education.

But it is important to remember that the Job Training Centers are not universities. They do not contend primarily with the mind. They must also concentrate on the hands and hearts of the girls. In short, they must try to do in one year what the American social, economic, and educational systems have failed to do for many years; make them capable of work, teach them how to work, and make them want to work.

There are girls at Poland Springs who cannot see well but who have never been tested for glasses. There are girls with speech problems who cannot communicate. There are girls who completed high school and learned nothing. And in many cases, the girls arrive at the center with a history of defeat and despair, at home, in school, and at work.

If these girls are to succeed they will need a great deal of help and especially individual help. At Poland Springs the girls will get this help, but having one staff member for every three girls costs money. There must also be a variety of classes available to avoid the regimentation that mars the public school systems . . . Variety of classes means variety of teachers and equipment, and this costs money, too.

Whether or not all this money and effort will do the job is the big question. According to Miss Grimes, the Poland Springs Job Corps is off to a good start with high morale among both the staffers and the corpsmen. But the real test will come several years from now when the government will be able to do followup studies on the Center's graduates and determine how well they are doing.

After the results are in the Job Corps officials can begin to revise their program, eliminating some parts and adding others. Perhaps then the costs of the program can be reduced. But some sort of expensive program like this will always be necessary, at least it will be necessary as long as we have industries that shirk their responsibilities, schools that do not teach, and governments that tolerate slums.

A "Wet" Burial for the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Edith Kermit Roosevelt which appeared in the Sunday Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa., on June 26, 1966, warning of the hazard of Soviet Russia's shipbuilding and shipping endeavors to the United States, our world trade, and the free world.

It would be well for this Nation to reappraise its maritime policies in the light of this commentary.

[From the Sunday Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa., June 26, 1966]

A "WET" BURIAL FOR THE UNITED STATES?—SOVIET MARITIME INTERESTS "OWN" THE OCEANS

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—The Soviets have promised to bury us through trade. They are in the process of doing just that. Their chief weapon is their merchant marine which they are using as part of their integrated military economic and political offensive.

The ominous consequences of the Soviet vessels and ships from the satellite countries are providing the bulk of the sinews of war to the Viet Cong. Moscow has maneuvered our NATO allies into collaborating in this effort. Shipping companies in Britain, Germany, Greece, Italy, France and the Scandinavian countries have been chartering their vessels to the Soviets through the Baltic Exchange. The London-based blue ribbon European shipowners club. This procedure enables Soviet Russia to free its own ships to engage in direct traffic with North Viet Nam as well as Cuba.

AVOID "BLACKLISTS"

The significance of this is that by using this shipping market our NATO allies can avoid U.S. "blacklists" or boycotts against their ships that trade with North Viet Nam. Thus, assurances by any NATO country to curb trading with North Viet Nam are virtually meaningless.

The names of the shipping companies and the numbers of ships that have been chartered to the Soviet Union since the USSR became a member of the Baltic Exchange last September is one of the world's most closely guarded secrets. The technique were described in testimony June 6 before the Senate Commerce Committee's special subcommittee on the merchant marine, Capt. J. W. Clark, chairman of the Committee of American Steamship Lines, told the subcommittee:

"It is a sad fact that not only are our 'allies' not assisting us to any extent in the Viet Nam conflict, but in many instances their ships are serving adjacent mainland ports of (Red) China and transhipping their cargoes to small coastal vessels for delivery to the Communists in North Viet Nam. This chartering and transhipment practice of our 'allies' produces the same results as would occur were their ships going directly into Haiphong" (major North Vietnamese port.)

BOASTS OF SUCCESS

The Soviets are making no secret of the significance of this operation. In a press release distributed by their embassy in Washington last Nov. 18, Viktor Bakayev, minister of the Soviet Merchant Marine, boasted how he had forced the unwilling "high navigation aristocracy" to let him into the Baltic Exchange which he referred to as a "capitalist fortress." Bakayev said after he boycotted the center of the world chartering market, it "suffered big losses." As a result of this blackmailing operation, he said, "the terms were favorable and we chartered ships at a rate moderate for this season."

This proves the dangerous economic power that is wielded by the minister of the Soviet Merchant Marine. The fact is that Bakayev can drive a hard bargain not only with Britain but with any of our Western allies as well as Japan. As the world's biggest customer of international shipowners, shipbuilding and brokers, the Soviets exert a tremendous influence. The USSR supports shipyards in nine Western countries and all of the satellite countries, supplying them with more than $1 billion worth of Russian ships and motor equipment.

Moscow's fleet expansion already has placed the Kremlin in a position to manipulate ocean freight rates. Through a superiority in terms of numbers of ships in-being and mobility, the USSR is advancing towards its objective of economic domination of the world. Last Oct. 18, the Maritime Transportation Letter, published by the German Shipowners Association, gave some of the details of rate cutting by the Soviet bloc. The newsletter said:

"The rates quoted by the shipping companies of the Eastern bloc often lie from 25–40 percent below the Western conference rates."

The newsletter went on to say that a Soviet controlled shipping company recently quoted a shipment of steel pipe to the Near East at 42 percent below the going rate.

THREAT IS MINIMIZED

At the same time, this steadily growing threat of the Soviet merchant marine on oceans continues to be either ignored or minimized as a factor in the formulation of U.S. national policy. By what has become the usual coincidence, U.S. Government policy on shipbuilding dovetails into this Soviet approach.

According to Edwin M. Hood, president, Shipbuilders Council of America, the Soviets are building ten times as many ships as we are with a lifting capacity eight times greater. He told the House Merchant Marine & Fisheries Committee on June 9, that 100 new ships were delivered to the Soviet fleet last year, while only 16 were delivered to the U.S. fleet.

Imagine this ratio: 100 to 16!

Recruiter's Woes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY H. McVICKER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, the Denver Post tells us that youthful idealism is causing a note of despair in the voice of industry recruiters combing the college campuses for job candidates.

A recent Associated Press survey turns up the fact that there are more openings and fewer applicants.

The draft has taken some June graduates and induced others to continue their schooling. But idealism also enters into the situation.

Many college graduates are now choosing jobs at low pay and uncertain working conditions in such programs as the Peace Corps and the poverty war's VISTA, the newspaper reports. It concludes editorially that as long as we have young people willing to make sacrifices to help others in need at home and abroad, we should not be too concerned about the future leadership of the Nation.

I offer this endorsement of the younger generation for the RECORD:

ENCOURAGING ASPECTS TO RECRUITER'S WOES

This is the time of the year when the voice of the industrial recruiter is heard throughout the land. The voice is joyful if all is going well on a placement of June college graduates, anguished if the opposite is true.

Lately, there has been an evident note of despair in the voices of industry recruiters. And an Associated Press survey last week discloses why: more jobs and fewer job candidates.

Obviously, the military draft has taken a number of June graduates out of the job market and indirectly created further candidate shortages by encouraging students to continue their education in graduate school to avoid service in the Viet Nam war.

But industry recruiters are also facing another unexpected development: youthful idealism.

High starting salaries and fringe benefits aren't as enticing to students as they once were. Many college graduates now are choosing jobs with low pay and uncertain working conditions with the Peace Corps and the war on poverty's VISTA.

This may be discouraging to companies unable to meet quotas for qualified new personnel, but it also has its encouraging aspects at the same time.

As long as the United States has young people who are willing to make personal sacrifices to help people in need at home and abroad, we need not be overly concerned about the future leadership of this nation.

Community Development Districts—Another Layer of Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to support the action of the House Appropriations Committee when, in April 1966, the administration's agricultural budget was trimmed by $113,611,000 less than the original request. This restored funds for proven programs while cutting back where reductions were needed.

One saving I favored, which was made at that time, was a $2,431,000 reduction in the request by the Rural Community Development Service. I agreed with the statement of the committee that existing Department of Agriculture personnel could handle the workload more effectively without an additional layer of supervision. But now we are faced with the revival of a similar request, under the guise of a new bill, S. 2934, despite the fact that the House already this year opposed expansion of the Rural Community Development Service. In addition, S. 2934 would duplicate existing governmental and private programs and would aggravate the problem of inflation.

Thus far, the bill has been railroaded through Congress. Public hearings in the House Committee on Agriculture consumed only 2 days, time which had previously been scheduled for the more vital school milk and child nutrition programs.

A committee minority report expressed disappointment with the limited scope of the hearings, as the committee failed to hear representatives from numerous agencies which conduct programs which would only be duplicated by this legislation. As the bill has been reported favorably by the committee, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the House should take a close look at this bill and vote it down when it is presented for our consideration.

The proponents of this bill allege that it will make available to rural communities the same type of development planning assistance as is now available to urban areas. A regional "community," usually embracing several counties, would be organized through State action and a planning board established in the district with members elected by the governing bodies of the various political subdivisions represented. Then the planning board could receive a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist in drawing up development plans.

UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION

The main trouble with the bill is that it may create an administrative boondoggle which will prevent officials at any level of government from solving rural problems. Existing planning programs already are available to rural communities on an individual or multicounty basis. Section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 permits Federal planning grants to nine different types of State, local, and regional planning units. Of the grants made under this program through fiscal 1965, $43 million have gone to 4,500 small communities and counties, $23 million to 130 metropolitan and regional planning areas, and $15 million to 30 States for statewide and interstate planning.

In addition to this HUD authority, planning activities are authorized through the Departments of Commerce, Labor, and HEW, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Economic Development Act of 1965, and the Department of Agriculture. Earlier this year, the Appropriations Committee noted that rural problems had been handled effectively through the regular established agencies of the Department of Agriculture, which have been working successfully with rural people for many years. These agencies can function more effectively if additional layers of supervision are not added between Washington and the rural areas.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ACTION

In addition, most States and localities have planning agencies of their own, both governmental and private. Local chambers of commerce are deeply involved in community planning. Communities in my State of Wyoming are participating in total community development programs as outlined by the National Chamber of Commerce.

Another rationalization for this bill has been the argument that local communities are not aware of their opportunities under present programs and that this bill is needed to acquaint them with the various Federal programs available. But the Department of Agriculture publishes an Agriculture Handbook which covers every program in existence. The National Chamber of Commerce has a clearinghouse service providing information on Federal programs applicable to local communities. Finally, myself and my colleagues in Congress are only too glad to help any State or local unit of government which is interested in utilizing a Federal program. I, personally, have processed hundreds of such requests.

INFLATIONARY PROBLEMS

With this country involved in a war and with the current problems of inflation, this bill provides for an open-end authorization, so that no one is sure how much money will be spent. Estimates have ranged from $5 million to $230 million.

The House should adhere to its previous policy of supporting the well established and useful agricultural programs, such as the school milk and school lunch programs, while cutting back on the unnecessary spending represented by bills like S. 2934.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The proponents of this bill argue that it would cure the ills of our cities by making the countryside more attractive. I have long been an advocate of helping the people in rural areas in order to discourage them from moving to the cities. It is quite true that many urban problems are the result of rural maladjustments that have been neglected. But these problems will not be solved by more plans. We have plans to implement today, only if we had the funds to do so. The money that will be spent for planning under this bill could be better put to use on current projects. It does no good to spend money on plans if you are afterward too broke to implement them. I represent a State which is largely rural and no one is more eager to develop this area than I am, but more planning boards are not the way to go about it.

There is absolutely no need for this legislation. There has been no evidence presented which shows that there is a deficiency of rural community planning or that there is not sufficient information available concerning Federal programs. This bill would only confuse the situation by creating another administrative unit, duplicating present efforts, and continuing to aggravate inflationary problems.

This session of Congress has compiled an admirable record of safeguarding the economy by reducing inflationary administrative requests. The House should continue to perform this vital role by defeating this unjustified and redundant legislation.

Ending the Great Treasury Raid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been most heartened by the increasing chorus of protest by individuals and groups around the country objecting to the continued abuse of the municipal bonding privilege through municipal industrial financing.

Recently, for example, Prof. Elbert Byrd, of the University of Maryland, wrote the Prince Georges County Commissioners opposing a plan to issue tax-exempt municipal bonds to finance a new plant for the Macke Vending Co.

As he said, the decision to issue such bonds would commit the county to a practice of subsidizing private corporations at the expense of the taxpayer. Because of the relevance of Professor Byrd's letter to the national situation, I include it in the RECORD hereafter.

Heartening too has been the recent firmness of attitude which has been exhibited by the Department of the Treasury in stopping this raid on the national coffers. I was particularly pleased to read in the June 29, 1966, Wall Street Journal that Department officials are giving "highest priority" to drafting a measure that will deny a tax exemption to new State and local bonds used to finance plants for commercial enterprises.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] and I have sponsored bills, H.R. 5587 and H.R. 5599, which would have the same effect as the proposed Treasury Department-supported legislation.

It is my hope that action can be taken soon to end once and for always this abuse of the municipal bonding privilege.

In order to bring my colleagues up to date on recent developments in this situation, I also will include two recent items from the Wall Street Journal, and urge attention to them:

[From the Washington Post, June 24, 1966]

CAPITAL COMMERCE: COUNTY'S PLAN TO SELL BONDS FOR PRIVATE PLANTS OPPOSED

(By S. Oliver Goodman)

A University of Maryland professor warned the Prince George's Board of County Commissioners against issuing tax-exempt bonds to finance buildings as a means of attracting new industry.

In a letter to the board, Elbert Byrd urged the commissioners from "making the basic decision to commit Prince George's County to a policy of subsidizing wealthy corporations . . ."

Byrd, a political science professor, referred to a proposal under consideration to sell county bonds to finance a new headquarters plant for the Macke Co., a Washington vending and food service firm.

Taken by itself, Byrd said, the Macke proposal of a $3.5 million bond issue is minor "but if Prince George's County embarks upon this road many more companies will feel called upon to demand equal treatment.

There has been a growing trend in recent years for towns, counties and even states to attract new industry by offering to construct buildings. These are financed at relatively low cost through the issuance of tax- exempt bonds. Congress has several bills under study to eliminate the practice as an abuse of the tax-exempt privilege.

Last year, nearly $1 billion of municipal bonds were issued, according to Byrd. This resulted, he said, in the loss of more than $20 million annually in tax revenues to the U.S. Treasury.

Byrd observed that authorities are warning that falure to end this practice will jeopardize the status of all tax-exempt municipals.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 24, 1966]

THE FINANCING GAME

Though it may seem a little surprising, state and local governments last year sold considerably more new securities than the U.S. Treasury. It isn't this non-Washington competition, however, that is mainly concerning Treasury Secretary Fowler.

Rather, it is the way some states and localities use their money. While most of it still goes into such enterprises as schools, roads and various public utilities, an increasing proportion goes for other purposes.

Many state and local governments, for example, borrow money to build factories which are then leased to incoming new industry. This practice, Mr. Fowler warns, eventually becomes self-defeating because "the advantage to any state or municipality decreases as more and more states and localities enter the field."

In addition, governmental units may sell bonds to finance commercial ventures like real estate development. Or, the Treasury Secretary charges, they may raise money with the "principal purpose" of immediately investing it in higher-yielding Federal securities to make a profit.

The Federal Government has a legitimate interest in these financing practices, since it in effect subsidizes them. Interest on the securities of state and local governments is exempt from Federal income tax, a fact that enables those governments to raise money a good deal more cheaply than they otherwise could.

With that in mind, Mr. Fowler cautions the states and localities that they are in danger of running a good thing right into the ground. Whatever the Government gives, whether it's tax exemptions or something else, the Government also can take away.

Although the Treasury Secretary is talking only of curbs on commercial enterprises, sure-thing investing and industrial subsidies, once started a crackdown could go further. There have long been critics who favor complete removal of the tax exemption from state and local securities.

So, it's actually of secondary significance that the states and localities are outdoing the Treasury at financing. In this case, what really matters is not that they're winning but how they're playing the game.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 29, 1966]

TAX REPORT: A SPECIAL SUMMARY AND FORECAST OF FEDERAL AND STATE TAX DEVELOPMENTS

Administration leans toward voiding tax-exemptions of industrial development bonds.

Treasury officials are giving the "highest priority" to drafting a measure that probably will deny a tax exemption to new state and local bonds used to finance plants for commercial enterprises. They also seek to curb the practice of floating tax-exempt bonds to purchase U.S. bonds and realizing a profit from the difference in interest rates. Following Treasury Secretary Fowler's mid-June hints of action along these lines, Administration men are striving to get their recommendations to Congress before the end of the current session. However, no action is considered likely before next year.

One reason for the go-ahead decision at this time: The accelerating pace at which industrial development bonds are being floated, it's contended, is making it increasingly difficult for states and localities to sell tax-exempt issues for civic improvement projects. At the end of last year, according to Treasury estimates, there were about $1 billion of outstanding industrial development bonds.

At least $300 million more were sold in the first four months of 1966, the Government figures.

True Moral Issue in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I have long viewed with concern, and I might add with a great deal of personal distaste, the constant carping criticism both abroad and at home by those who oppose our country's efforts in Vietnam.

The recent decision to nullify the strategic importance of oil stockpiles touched off a new wave of indignation on the part of those who for various reasons oppose our efforts to keep South Vietnam free. While this reaction was not unpredictable, as an American and as a Member of Congress, I find the critics deep concern for the Communist and the lack of concern for the safety of our fighting men, to put it mildly, obnoxious.

The Houston Post, in its editorial of July 3, 1966, gave this entire matter the perspective long needed.

Personally, I support the decision of our President to eliminate all strategic stockpiles in North Vietnam. Our men on the battleline do not deserve the added handicap of fighting a war with one hand tied behind their backs.

I strongly urge my colleagues attention to the accompanying editorial:

TRUE MORAL ISSUE IN VIETNAM

Opponents of any American action to help the people of South Viet Nam keep their freedom reacted predictably to the bombing of a few oil storage tanks on the outskirts of Hanoi and Haiphong.

Their tender concern for petroleum storage facilities is ludicrous, of course, but at least they are consistent in opposing and denouncing anything that makes it harder for Communists to kill American and South Vietnamese fighting men.

One can respect them perhaps for their consistency but hardly for pretending that their opposition is based on morality, by which they fool nobody unless it is themselves.

Under the twisted reasoning that they use in trying to justify their positions, it is moral for Communists to try to take what they want by force, but it is immoral for anyone to oppose them.

It is moral for Communists to commit aggression and try to impose their brand of tyranny upon others, but it is immoral to defend freedom.

It is moral for Communists to practice murder, terrorism, assassination and barbaric cruelty against civilians on a mass scale, but it is immoral if some noncombatants unavoidable are killed or wounded in the course of non-Communist defensive military operations.

It is moral for Communists to use very weapon, tactic or device available to them, but it immoral for non-Communists to use the weapons they have against Communists.

It is moral for Communists to kill large numbers of unarmed civilians by exploding bombs in the streets of Saigon or elsewhere, but it is immoral to use napalm or B-52 bombers against Communist combatants.

It is moral for Communists to increase their military effort, but it is immoral for non-Communists to try to match or offset that escalation.

It is moral for Communists to kill countless numbers of North Vietnamese in trying to impose their system upon the people of the North and to change the whole Vietnamese pattern of life, but it is immoral for at least half of the Vietnamese people to refuse to submit to this enslavement.

And now, it is moral for Communists to import and use petroleum products for purposes of killing Americans and South Vietnamese, but it is immoral to try to keep them from doing so.

Much is made of the fact that the oil storage facilities bombed were near heavily populated areas. The location is, of course, under the control of the North Vietnamese government. The choice is not that of the South Vietnamese or American governments. The Communists never have been deterred by the fact that a target was in a populated area, whether a city or a village.

Actually, the bombing of the oil tanks was a precision operation, with great effort being made to prevent civilian casualties. The targets were, in fact, somewhat isolated from thickly populated areas. And, if some civilians were in the areas where the bombs fell, it was not from lack of warning. Some Washington newsmen collaborated in seeing to that.

There is a moral issue in Viet Nam, a very important one, although one to which opponents of American action appear blind. It is whether or not other free people should stand aside and permit more than 15 million people who want no part of Communism to be either exterminated or enslaved. That is the moral issue that has been involved in Viet Nam from the beginning of the Communist effort to take over South Viet Nam. Who then are the truly morally guilty?

It can be argued that the use of physical force in human relations always is immoral, under any circumstances, but it can be even more immoral not to defend the things to which one attaches great value against those who do use force.

Reds Won't Let Their Youth See the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's sport fans were shocked and disappointed when the Soviet Union and its puppets in Warsaw canceled athletic events between their teams and the U.S. teams. The motivation of the Communists was purely propaganda, with the possibility existing that they were afraid of the power of the U.S. athletic aggregations. This pattern of frustrating contact even on a nonpolitical level is seen in the recent action of the Rumanian Government in interfering with the hopes of their students to travel to the United States.

I insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks an article by Dumitru Danielopol which appeared in the June 17 edition of the San Diego Union:

REDS WON'T LET THEIR YOUTH SEE THE UNITED STATES

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

Cultural exchanges can serve a useful purpose—if they are handled properly.

When the well-known Parisian painter, Dimitrie Berea, was exhibiting recently in Los Angeles and San Francisco, he was asked to lecture at some California campuses.

He accepted.

He told students that an artist must live in freedom if he is to create. He deplored the regimentation forced on artists in Communist countries.

Having lived in Romania until 1946, Berea speaks from first-hand experience.

Much to Berea's surprise, the students were cool, even cold, to his remarks. At the University of California at Berkeley, he met open hostility and jeers.

"The so-called 'progressives,' the 'new left' which is operating on the campuses have done a pretty intensive brainwashing job," Berea said.

"Obviously your young people do not know what communism is really like. Otherwise they would not so easily accept such propaganda."

From behind the Iron Curtain there comes a different story.

The celebrated French actors, Jean Louis Barrault and his wife Madleine Renaud, were recently playing in Bucharest on a cultural exchange program.

Packed houses greeted them. Eager students asked Barrault to lecture to them.

At first he refused. He had not prepared for such eventualities. Finally he accepted.

Eager young people listened to him.

He talked of the modern theater in France and other countries. He deplored attempts to infiltrate political thought into modern plays.

The theater is meant to entertain, he said, not to sell political ideas.

His audience burst into applause.

As he finished, the students asked Barrault to recite something.

The first thing that came into his mind was the song of the French resistance during the Nazi occupation of Paris.

When he reached the line "liberte, liberte, liberte" the audience rose to its feet and exploded into a rousing ovation.

"It was dramatic," said a woman who was present. "It was like a cry, like an appeal for freedom from hundreds of Romanian youths."

Barrault was moved to tears.

The experiences of the two artists pose some interesting thoughts.

We know the Communist regimes would not dare allow their young students to visit America.

But what if some of our "new left" youngsters went to live for a while among the students behind the Iron Curtain?

They'd soon find that it's easier to flirt with communism in California than to live under it in Europe.

Noted Americans Honor Washington Correspondent Ben Cole on His 50th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, it is not hard to get prominent people to write perfunctory laudatory letters about someone on his 50th birthday.

But it is impossible to get people to write letters of the warmth of those which follow, unless the person praised has actually earned a warm spot in the hearts of those who do the writing.

To paraphrase Will Rogers, I never met a man who didn't like Ben Cole.

The letters follow:

STATE OF INDIANA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Indianapolis, July 7, 1966.

BENJAMIN R. COLE, Esq.,
Washington Correspondent,
The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Somehow it seems appropriate that you are marking your 50th birthday exactly ten days after the inauguration of Medicare. Fifty years are not the same as sixty five years, but they do demonstrate your determination to reach that golden age when Geritol calls.

Your long tenure as a scribe on the Washington scene probably means you have a book up your sleeve. Louis Ludlow wrote *From Cornfield to Press Gallery*. Your rural beginnings, your service as a political reporter, and your career at the Nation's Capitol match the record of Ludlow remarkably. But your record is Ben Cole's record and you have covered the news of your era well.

Happy birthday, Ben!

Sincerely,

ROGER D. BRANIGIN,
Governor of Indiana.

CONGRESSIONAL STAFF DIRECTORY,
Washington, D.C., July 8, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington Correspondent, The Indianapolis Star, National Press Club Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: When we first met during the Indianapolis mayorality campaign in 1947, neither of us were thinking much about fiftieth birthdays or Washington.

This note is to tell you how much I appreciate the full measure of yourself you have given your friends during the short, short nineteen years that have, someway, passed all to suddenly.

During those years I have usually agreed with what you wrote and have always agreed with your sense of justice, your kindness and your sincerity as you wrote.

Together you and I went through an interesting period when, for all to short a time, we had a President in the White House who was younger than we. I expect we, and all those in our general age group, aged more in those days than is possible on any one birthday since.

Congratulations. Happy Birthday. You're only one day older than you were yesterday.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
(Former 11th District Representative,
State of Indiana.)

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1966.
MR. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington Correspondent,
Indianapolis Star and Arizona Republic,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COLE: I join your many friends in offering warmest congratulations as you celebrate your fiftieth birthday. You have my good wishes for continued good health and happiness and a long career of covering activities in behalf of the people of Indianapolis by Congressmen Jacobs—first the father, now the son, and—who knows—maybe one day the grandson.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1966.
MR. BEN COLE,
McLean, Va.

DEAR BEN: My warmest congratulations to you upon the anniversary observance of your 50th birthday. I hope in the years to come you will celebrate many more bearing witness to years of health, activity and usefulness.

When I arrived in Washington, of course we were friends already and had worked together when I was in the Legislature and you were working in Indianapolis. I was delighted when you were assigned to Washington shortly after I was elected to Congress. Both in Indianapolis and in Washington it has been extremely gratifying to work with you. You have respected my confidence and I think your reporting has been objective and of the nature that a reporter should strive to achieve. I have always found when I needed information or advice from a trustworthy source I could call on you. This policy has stood the test of years and I have designated you a journalist of the highest integrity.

Because of your pleasant bearing and optimistic attitude, you are always a welcome visitor and I know you will see through the window-dressing to the core of any matter we are discussing.

Just let me say, Happy Birthday from one good friend to another.

Sincerely yours,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
Member of Congress.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND
PUBLIC WELFARE,
July 6, 1966.
MR. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Correspondent,
The Arizona Republic,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: This is not the first congratulatory letter I've had the pleasure of writing to you and I trust it will not be the last.

Your tenure in Washington goes back much further than mine, of course, but in my limited time here I have come to recognize why you are held in such high professional regard by your colleagues in the press corps, your editors and publisher, and by those members of the Congress whose offices you cover.

Citizens in Arizona as well as Indiana are indeed fortunate to have a man like you reporting in the capital. Your work has always been distinguished for accuracy and fairness, and no public servant could ask for more.

On the occasion of your 50th birthday, it is a privilege to join with your many other friends in Washington in expressing the hope that you will be covering the Arizona-Indiana beat for many more years.

Best personal wishes.
Sincerely,
PAUL FANNIN,
U.S. Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, July 8, 1966.
Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JACOBS: Secretary Freeman is in the Far East and will be out of the country on July 12, when the reception honoring Ben Cole is to be held.

I know the Secretary will be disappointed at being unable to attend this event. Please extend to Mr. Cole birthday greetings and wishes for success and happiness.

Sincerely,
JOHN C. MCDONALD,
Assistant to the Secretary.

GATES, GATES & MCNAGNY,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
Columbia City, Ind., July 8, 1966.
Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
c/o Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: I have been advised of your 50th birthday which occurs on Sunday, July 10th.

I am indeed sorry that I cannot attend the reception which is to be held for you on July 12th.

I want to congratulate you upon reaching the ripe old age of 50 years.

It has been my privilege to have known you personally during one-half of that half a century and as you know, I have always had a deep affection for you and have appreciated the fine friendship that we have enjoyed through that span of years.

I trust that you have continuous success, happiness and good health in the years ahead.

I shall always remember you best during those years when you were covering the State House. I recall particularly the time that I sent for you to offer you a position in the State Government and you were under the impression that I had sent for you to be critical on some of the articles that you had written. You were greatly relieved when you found out that I wanted you to take a position in the State Government and that I was not critical of you. You, of course, made a great decision when you stayed with the Indianapolis Star and you have made great progress since that time and your friends are proud of the great success that you have had in the newspaper field.

Again I congratulate you and I am sorry that I cannot be present at your reception. I do trust that before too long a time I will have the privilege of seeing you and enjoying a good visit.

I am grateful to Congressman JACOBS in advising me of this occasion and giving me this opportunity to write you.

With kindest personal regards to yourself and family, I am
Sincerely,
RALPH F. GATES,
(Former Governor, State of Indiana.)

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
July 12, 1966.
Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Deeply regret my inability to be with you tonight for reception honoring Ben Cole. He is an excellent correspondent, one in whom I have the highest esteem, and I only wish I could be there with you in marking his 50th birthday. The Arizona Republic is as proud of him as am I.

BARRY GOLDWATER.
(Former United States Senator, State of Arizona.)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 12, 1966.
MR. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: It's a pleasure for me to offer birthday congratulations.

And it's doubly pleasant to join in a tribute to you and your service to your newspaper and to the people of Indiana.

Since words are your stock and trade, I couldn't hope to impress you with my Congressional rhetoric.

I'll say only that I appreciate your interest in the Ninth District. I appreciate your accuracy and honesty in writing about me and my work. And, on behalf of all Hoosiers, I appreciate your fine sense of humor.

Your friendships on both sides of the aisle attest to your integrity and fair play.

Many happy returns of the day.
Sincerely,
LEE H. HAMILTON,
Member of Congress.

HANDLEY & MILLER, INC.,
July 10, 1966.
Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
National Press Club,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: I couldn't pass this opportunity to extend birthday greetings from both Barbara and myself, and to wish you continued health, happiness and success in the years ahead.

As one who is already past the 50th meridian of life, I do want to reassure you that life really does begin at 50—that is if you just care anymore.

I am only sorry that I can't attend Andy's birthday reception for you Sunday but, unfortunately, HARTKE still has my plane ticket in his pocket, and has had since '58.

Best wishes.
Your old friend,
HAROLD W. HANDLEY.
(Former Governor, State of Indiana.)

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
July 8, 1966.
Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington Correspondent,
Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: It gives me great pleasure to add my good wishes for continued success upon this most fitting observance of the 50th birthday of one of Washington's most outstanding correspondents, Ben Cole.

My acquaintance with Ben dates back many years. I am proud to say that my esteem and appreciation for his fine talents as an excellent journalist and a truly fine person have grown over the years and have become deeply rooted into a lasting friendship.

Congratulations, Ben, for the splendid record you have made for yourself not only on the Washington scene, but also with your readers throughout the years.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely,
VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
July 8, 1966.
Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: I am indeed pleased to congratulate you as you celebrate your fiftieth birthday. Speaking from experience, I can assure you that the second half-century can be even more enjoyable than the first. All of us who have come to know you and appreciate your keen insight into the Washington world and to value your opinions and advice are indeed grateful for the service you have rendered, not only to those of us in the Congress, but to the public as well. I am sure that we can continue to enjoy the warmth and wisdom of your friendship and understanding for many years to come.

You are an honest newsman—indeed a credit to your profession—and, above all, a good and dear friend. I am proud to be among those who honor you on this auspicious occasion. Many, many happy returns.

With best personal wishes,
Your friend,
CARL HAYDEN,
U.S. Senator.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
Lafayette, Ind., July 12, 1966.
Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR COLE: Recently I heard a journalistic anecdote which may be an old one to you, but it was a new one to me. It goes like this.

A new copy boy, working nights on a large metropolitan paper, stopped the night managing editor and announced that he had been a copy boy long enough, he now wanted to be a reporter. When the editor asked him why he felt he was qualified to be a reporter, the boy replied, "I've been watching them. It's easy!"

I suspect that the readers of your newspaper columns may be somewhat like the copy boy: your excellence and journalistic ability make it seem so easy. On the contrary, I know that it has taken dedication to duty and painstaking effort to interpret correctly for the enlightenment of your readers the many facets of the Washington scene.

I send heartiest congratulations to you on this day, your mid-century birthday. I hope that all the readers you serve will continue to benefit for many years to come from your insight and uncanny ability to analyze and report the complex national and political problems that face our nation and affect us as individuals. Without reporters of your great interpretative ability, we citizens would be hopelessly entangled in shrouds of ignorance and misunderstanding.

With many happy returns of the day, I am,
Yours most cordially,
FREDERICK L. HOVDE,
President.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, July 8, 1966.
Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ANDY: Thank you for your kind invitation to the Vice President to attend a reception celebrating the birthday of Benjamin Cole to be held July 12.

The Vice President would like to be able to accept. Unfortunately, he will be in St. Louis at that time. However, the Vice President has asked me to pass along his regrets and to thank you for thinking of him.

With all best wishes.
Sincerely,
WILLIAM CONNELL,
Administrative Assistant.

JACOBS AND JACOBS,
Indianapolis, Ind., July 10, 1966.
Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SON: Ben Cole is a kind, generous and just man. His discourse is stimulating and always seasoned with good humor. He would never willingly hurt anyone.

You are good to honor him on his 50th birth anniversary. He was your friend when you were a boy. He comforted me while you were away at war. He is my friend and I consider him one of God's noblemen.

You recall that through the years I have told you that he was one of the few I missed when my constituency came to miss me so deeply it voted overwhelming for me to come home.

May Ben have as many more birth anniversaries. The world will be richer for every one.

Love,
ANDREW JACOBS, Sr.,
(Former 11th District Representatives, State of Indiana.)

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 8, 1966.
Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been asked to respond further to your invitation to the President to attend the reception you are planning for Mr. Benjamin R. Cole on July twelfth.

Although it will not be possible for the President to attend or send a personal message, he is certainly appreciative of your thoughtfulness of him and sends his warm, good wishes for the occasion.

Sincerely,
W. MARVIN WATSON,
Special Assistant to the President.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, July 11, 1966.
Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COLE: It is a pleasure to join in paying tribute to a talented journalist.

Although the term "public service" is generally used to describe government work, it is most certainly applicable to your career as a seeker and reporter of truth.

Best wishes for continued success.
Sincerely,
NICHOLAS deB. KATZENBACH.

MCHALE, COOK & WELCH,
Indianapolis, Ind., July 10, 1966.
Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Providence has given to America riches, strength, and power, and may I paraphrase Bill Herschell who wrote "Ain't God Good to Indiana" by saying "Ain't God good to The Indianapolis Star and its reader for He has given us Benjamin R. Cole, Indiana's greatest Washington correspondent". I regret that I cannot be present to celebrate the deserving recognition you will be accorded on your 50th Anniversary by your many friends in recognition of your great ability to accurately and fairly report the doings and happenings in Washington without slanting the facts. In so doing, you have ingratiated yourself into the hearts of us all and when the legislative history of Washington during these years is written, the historians will have to get the facts from Ben Cole's files.

I am proud of you and of your great work and of the fact that I went through high school in Logansport with your beloved mother and your uncle, and therefore, I could expect nothing else from you.

As the Irish would say, "May the good Lord hold you in the palm of His hand and may the wind be ever at your back" for many more years.

Sincerely,
FRANK M. MCHALE.

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS,
Rochester, N.Y., July 8, 1966.
Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACOBS: Many thanks for the invitation to join the birthday party for Benjamin R. Cole.

As one who regards Washington as the news capital of the world, and who never ceases to recall with pleasure five years on the Washington scene, I would like nothing better than to meet with you, Ben Cole and the others—I never miss a Washington press corps rally if I can help it.

I have a trip to the mid-West on Tuesday, however, so all I can do is say thanks again for counting me in and congratulations on the idea of honoring Ben Cole, one of the tops in the Washington press corps.

With very best wishes to you both,
Cordially,
PAUL MILLER, *President.*

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1966.
Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington Correspondent,
Indianapolis Star and Arizona Republic.

DEAR MR. COLE: I want to join with your many friends in extending heartiest congratulations to you on your birthday.

May you enjoy good health and happiness today and for many years to come.

With kind regards.
Sincerely yours,
LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1966.
Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Central Newspapers,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Happy Birthday! It is a real pleasure to express my good wishes to you on your "half-century" mark—and it would take another half-century to say thank you for your friendship and many kindnesses to me. Arizona, as Indiana, is proud to claim you, and fortunate to have a newspaperman of your integrity, dedication and talent on whom to depend and call. Working with you over the past years has been a very gratifying and happy experience, and I look forward to many more years of this pleasant association.

May you have many more happy birthdays, each bringing you only the best and happiest years.

Sincerely,
JOHN J. RHODES,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 12, 1966.
Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington Bureau, The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: One of the real pleasures of being a Member of the Indiana delegation in Congress is the constant working acquaintance and friendship I have with you.

Not only are you a competent and careful craftsman of the journalistic trade, but you are a true friend and adviser to those of us who represent the people of Indiana.

In my three terms in the House, I have come to regard you not only as a fine correspondent and talented writer, but actually as another Member of the Hoosier delegation in Congress.

We have all benefitted many times from your great store of governmental information and experience, and your wealth of Indiana and national political knowledge.

I consider you, Ben, as one of the finest newsmen on the Washington scene, and wish to offer my sincere congratulations for your past years of service to your employer and the citizens of Indiana.

My warmest wishes, too, on your 50th birthday. May it be the beginning of a very happy and successful year for you.

Sincerely,
RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 8, 1966.
Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACOBS: Thank you for your letter of July 5 inviting Secretary Rusk to attend a reception in honor of your friend Mr. Benjamin R. Cole and to send a message of congratulations on the occasion of his 50th birthday.

Secretary Rusk has not yet returned from his trip to the Far East, but in view of his very full schedule following his return I regret that he will not be able to accept your kind invitation to the reception or to send a message. I know, however, that he would want me to send best wishes on his behalf to Mr. Cole.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas MacArthur II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Knox, Ind.,
July 9, 1966.

Dear Friend Ben: I am proud and happy to extend my warmest congratulations on your 50th birthday, and regret very much that I cannot attend Representative Jacobs' party in your honor on the 12th. I well recall our fine relations during your tour of duty at the State House and I still enjoy your column in the Star.

Best wishes to you and your loved ones.

Sincerely,

Henry F. Schricker.
(Former Governor, State of Indiana).

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1966.

Mr. Benjamin R. Cole,
The Arizona Republic,
The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Ben: It occurs to me that July 10, 1916, was a rather significant date in history. For example, on that day the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Omnibus Revenue Bill by a vote of 240–140, Pancho Villa issued a proclamation declaring his intention to recapture parts of Arizona for Mexico, the French advanced to within one mile of Perrone in their drive to remove the Kaiser from France, and President Wilson told a World Salesmanship Congress in Detroit that the Democratic Party was a friend of business.

Yet one must confess to a certain disinterest in the aforementioned when they are compared to an even more momentous event of overriding importance—the birth of Benjamin R. Cole.

Ben, we are indebted to your mother and father for their foresight. Without your fine, journalistic hand, life here in Washington might occasionally grow tedious.

My very best wishes to you on this birthday. The entire staff joins with me in the hope that the next 50 years will be just as you want them to be.

With warmest personal regards, I am.

As always,

George F. Senner, Jr.

U.S. District Court,
Southern District of Indiana,
Indianapolis, Ind., July 9, 1966.

Dear Ben: Andy's much appreciated letter announcing your 50th birthday on Sunday, July 10th, and inviting me to the reception in your honor on Tuesday, reached me during my absence from Court while on vacation. I am grateful to him for the announcement and invitation so that I too can be among those of your host of friends to give you birthday greetings and best wishes on this happy occasion.

I need not tell you of the high esteem in which I have always held you, both as a man and as a writer—my warm regard and respect for you, I am sure, have spoken that message many times. So it is with real joy that I—and Vitallas joins me—wish many, many more happy birthdays, and may you and your family be blessed with an abundance of good health in the years to come.

Except for the distance that separates us, I would certainly be present on Tuesday.

With warmest personal regards, I remain,

Cordially,

Bill Steckler.

United Press International,
New York, N.Y., July 6, 1966.

Mr. Benjamin R. Cole,
c/o Hon. Andrew Jacobs, Jr.,
234 Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ben Cole: I regret very much that I cannot attend the reception that Congressman Jacobs is giving in your honor on Sunday, July 10. I am compelled to be in Chicago this weekend and will not be able to get back in time.

Although I have not had the privilege of meeting you personally I know your name and your reputation quite well and I salute you on the fine work that you have done for your newspapers in Washington over the years.

I'm glad that Congressman Jacobs is celebrating your birthday and not your retirement. Carry on!

Cordially,

Mims Thomason,
President.

The Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, July 12, 1966.

Mr. Benjamin Cole,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ben: Not only do I want to congratulate you for the singular achievement of reaching the age of 50 with your imagination, professional integrity, and zest for the job undiminished, but I also want to congratulate Andy Jacobs for having the foresight to honor you on this occasion.

As Andy noted, the first Congressman from Indiana you were assigned to cover was his father. In a similar vein, when I came to Washington as a freshman Congressman you were the first reporter that it was my pleasure to become acquainted with. The constructive and understanding way you have covered not only Arizona news but my own personal part in it has earned you my greatest respect. I am happy to count you among my best friends and hope we are both around to mark the successful conclusion of your second 50 years.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior.

Indiana State Chamber of Commerce,
Indianapolis, July 7, 1966.

Mr. Benjamin R. Cole,
Washington Correspondent,
The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ben: As you reach the ripe, young age of 50, I want to join your host of other friends in expressing appreciation for the fine job you have done and are doing to keep us Hoosiers informed about the Washington scene.

With your background of reporting governmental and political affairs in Indiana, you continually bring to us news and comments tailored to Hoosier readers. The fact that you occasionally deal with the antics as well as the actions of legislative and administrative leaders in Washington, and particularly of those from Indiana, adds flavor to the newsy reports and columns.

John Barnett tells me the members of the State Chamber staff rely heavily on your informative weekly reports outlining the votes of Indiana members of Congress on issues.

I wish you many more happy and successful years of reporting from Washington about Hoosiers and for Hoosiers. If our paths do not cross before then, I hope in any event to have the opportunity to visit with you again at the Chamber of Commerce Congressional Reception next spring.

Sincerely yours,

Walter W. Walb,
President.

July 8, 1966.

Mr. Benjamin R. Cole,
%Andrew Jacobs, Jr.,
234 Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ben: Congratulations on your many years of faithful interpretation of Washington to Hoosiers.

Knowing the characters involved as I do, I have a real appreciation of the quality of the job you have done and sincerely feel that all of us have a much better understanding of the problems of our national government.

May we have many more years of your wisdom!

With warm regards,

Sincerely,

Matthew E. Welsh.
(Former Governor, State of Indiana.)

Hearty Congratulations to Governor Scranton and the Pennsylvania Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of Congress and the American people the fine editorial from the Pittsburgh Press which is an excellent statement of the outstanding record of educational development in Pennsylvania:

Dividend of the Times

These are times of high production, high consumption, high demand for labor—and, taking the bitter with the sweet, high living costs. Most of us are earning more and living better, and more of us are employed than was the case a few years ago.

We get some excellent dividends from all this activity. The State of Pennsylvania ended its fiscal year June 30 with a record high budget surplus of $134,500,000. Much of that came from the two big taxes collected by the State—the corporate net income tax and the 5 per cent sales tax. More profits for industry and more purchases by consumers combined to swell the treasury receipts.

One dividend from this windfall was a one-shot bonus to public schools throughout the state of 34 million dollars, and anyone familiar with the financial needs of our school system can appreciate how welcome such an unexpected boost will be.

Another will be appreciated by some 17,000 families who have members enrolled at the University of Pittsburgh. The treasury surplus makes possible legislation to increase State aid to Pitt by $9,700,000 and thus make possible a reduction of the tuition rate from $1400 a year to $450.

This plan, which makes Pitt a State-related university, has been long in the making and has unfortunately been delayed in the Legislature pending passage of the general appropriation bill which takes precedence over other appropriations.

However, Governor Scranton has announced a general bipartisan agreement on the Pitt appropriation which will make possible quick passage in time for the families of Pitt students to make their financial plans before the school year starts in September.

This is the forerunner of a new plan for higher education in Pennsylvania, still to be recommended, which should make it easier for deserving students to get to college at a reasonable cost. It may be noted also that the expanded State scholarship loan program should aid generally both students and the colleges they attend.

An encouraging feature of the budget windfall is that, according to most of the signs discernible now, it will continue well into the new fiscal year and probably beyond it. The State's improved financial health thus will be reflected in better financing not only for education but for other essential State services.

Kawaa: VISTA Volunteer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I received positive indication today that we are winning a war on our own shores. I of course refer to the encouraging signs from VISTA, our flagbearer in the war against ignorance and poverty in these United States.

Mr. Earl Kawaa, 21, a young resident of Kaunakakai, Molokai, Hawaii, is back in his home State for a vacation of 3 weeks before returning to serve as a VISTA volunteer in New Mexico. Mr. Kawaa is an outstanding example of the caliber of young men and women our Nation is producing, one of those who are willing to spend several years of their lives in the service of their country.

Reporter Gregg Kakesako's interview with Volunteer Kawaa appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of June 30, 1966. I now submit the newspaper article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SELLING BENEFITS OF EDUCATION: ISLANDER BACK AFTER VISTA STINT ON INDIAN RESERVATION

(By Gregg Kakesako)

A man from Kaunakakai, Molokai, who has been a V.I.S.T.A. recreational director on an Indian reservation for the past year, is back in the Islands for a three-week vacation.

Earl Kawaa, 21, was assigned to the Pueblo Acoma Indian Reservation, New Mexico, as director of physical resources.

As a member of the Volunteers in Service to America, V.I.S.T.A., he was involved in establishing recreational activities for the Indian youths.

"I built a baseball diamond and organized several leagues for both girls as well as boys while I was there," Kawaa said.

DESCRIBES JOB

"My job there was to teach these young people games and to make them realize the opportunities which are offered to them," he added.

"In fact I was there primarily to sell them the benefits of education."

The past year seems to have also benefited Kawaa, for he revealed that his work with the Indians developed confidence in himself and enabled him to express his feelings with a lot more ease.

He noted that his four-week training period had prepared him for the assignment and once the people got over their "edgy" feeling they responded enthusiastically.

PEACE PIPE

Using the baseball as a modified 20th century peace pipe, Kawaa tried to approach the students in an informal way.

"The younger generation has been exposed to both cultures and is willing to accept progress and assimilate it into their own culture," Kawaa noted.

"Yet many of the youths do not want to leave the reservations because the outside world is uncomfortable to them," he added. "They would rather stay and improve the conditions within their culture."

Kawaa revealed that he joined V.I.S.T.A. because it offered opportunity to travel, to see how people in other areas live, and to exchange cultural ideas.

NOT MATTER OF MONEY

Asked about the personal material benefits of such a program, Kawaa said that he was receiving about $80 every two weeks.

"Yet when you join V.I.S.T.A., you're not in it for the money," he explained. "Once you become involved with the environment and the people the rewards are far greater."

"In fact money doesn't seem to take that much of a precedent; it's the opportunity to help and to obtain a broader view outside of your own culture that counts," Kawaa concluded.

V.I.S.T.A. has been referred to as the "domestic peace corps."

AEC Testimony Contradicts Conservationists on Dam Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Grand Canyon dams have been criticized as an outdated means of financing the proposed central Arizona project.

Alternate means of generating salable power may serve the purpose equally well, and without necessitating the damage to the Grand Canyon which would be caused by Bridge Canyon—or Haulapai—and Marble Canyon Dams.

Nuclear power has been suggested as a particularly promising alternative which is expected to outstrip the efficiency of hydropower long before the Grand Canyon dams can pay for themselves. The competition of low-cost nuclear power may well prevent the dams from returning their cost to the Treasury.

A newspaper account in the Denver Post of May 26, 1966, attempted to relate these proposals to recent testimony of Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee.

This account, however, went too far in implying that Chairman Seaborg considered nuclear power an unfeasible alternative to hydropower from Grand Canyon dams.

As was indicated by a recent exchange between Dr. Richard C. Bradley, of Colorado Springs, and Dr. Seaborg, the testimony of Dr. Seaborg did not relate to the Grand Canyon case. Dr. Seaborg's remarks do not at all conflict with proposals for a nuclear alternative to dams in the Grand Canyon.

For the information of my colleagues, I request that the Denver Post article, the letters of Dr. Bradley and Dr. Seaborg, and the pertinent portion of the hearing record be included in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, May 26, 1966]

AEC TESTIMONY CONTRADICTS CONSERVATIONISTS ON DAM PLANS

WASHINGTON.—Conservationists and others who oppose the plan to build Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams on the lower Colorado River apparently have based their arguments on a belief hydroelectric power is on the way out.

In a relatively few years, they have said, the chief source of power in the United States, including the areas that would be served by the Bridge and Marble Dam power stations, will be atomic reactors.

As Dr. Spencer M. Smith Jr., secretary of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, told the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee recently:

"It appears to us that the problem of competition and its effect upon peaking power rates, the lower cost nuclear alternative and the rather minimal contribution to the lower Colorado River basin development fund by the Marble Canyon project are sufficient to argue against the proposal and to cause immediate consideration of a more efficient alternative."

Testimony at hearings held by the House public works appropriations subcommittee last month and released Thursday show that this view isn't shared by the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Asked by Rep. GLENN R. DAVIS, R-Wis., whether he can foresee a substantial substitution of nuclear power as a source of electric power for the conventional and hydroelectric sources of power that we now have, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg replied:

"Not for many years. I don't look at it as a substitution. I look at it as a supplement of the fossil fuel source."

Atomic power, he added, may ultimately substitute for conventional power but this won't take place "for many decades."

OUT OF ACCORD

"Then," Davis continued, "when people tell us . . . that we don't need particular sources of hydroelectric power, this isn't in accordance with the practical situation as you see it?"

"That is right," Seaborg replied. "I can see a number of situations where it is to our country's economic advantage to exploit a source of hydro-electric power."

He was joined in stressing the importance of hydroelectric and other types of nonnuclear power by Dr. G. F. Tape, a colleague on the AEC. Said Tape:

"The true conservationist, and I mean with respect to conserving our energy resources, would like to see every bit of energy taken from every drop of water as it runs to the sea in the same sense we would like to see every drop of energy taken from a drop of uranium ore that comes from the ground."

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS,
COLORADO COLLEGE,
Colorado Springs, Colo., June 2, 1966.

Dr. GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: The enclosed news story from the May 26 issue of the Denver Post puts an interpretation on some of your recent remarks that I wonder if you really intended. Specifically, your statement that conventional power sources will continue to be useful for many decades to come is being taken as a refutation of the conservationists' claim that power can be generated economically in the Southwest without building any hydroelectric dams in Grand Canyon. I find nothing in the text of the news story itself to suggest that you were endorsing these particular dams. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the headlines suggest it.

You are probably well aware of this controversy. The federal Bureau of Reclamation proposes to build Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams in Grand Canyon to serve as "cash registers" for its water salvage program in the Southwest. The conservationists oppose the dams on the grounds that they will impair Grand Canyon National Monument and Grand Canyon National Park and will violate the integrity of the entire national park system. They have also pointed out at Congressional hearings that these dams will cost much more per installed kilowatt than thermal plants, will take 50 years to amortize, will evaporate several million dollars worth of water each year, and will sell power at a cost that is only barely competitive with other sources even today.

Dam proponents dismiss the ethical and aesthetic arguments as being unimportant, but they do not dismiss the economic arguments. It is all the more important, therefore, that the record be straight as to what is fact and what is interpretation.

Would you be willing to write a brief, clarifying statement, perhaps as a letter to the editor of the Denver Post? I think it would be very helpful if you would tell to what extent your endorsement of conventional power plants in general implies an endorsement of any particular project, such as, for example, Bridge and Marble Dams in Grand Canyon.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD C. BRADLEY,
Professor of Physics.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1966.

DR. RICHARD C. BRADLEY
Professor of Physics
Colorado College
Colorado Springs, Colorado

DEAR DR. BRADLEY: In response to your letter of June 2, 1966, I am enclosing for your information the complete text of the testimony referred to in the newspaper story you were kind enough to send to me.

As you will observe from the text of my testimony, I responded to a question concerning a hypothetical dam on the Columbia River, and my reply led to a general discussion of the value of developing the three sources of electrical energy under the proper circumstances. My remarks were offered neither as a general unqualified endorsement of hydroelectric power nor of any particular project. The point of my response was that the question of whether or not to build a new dam on the Columbia River would depend on the circumstances attending the particular situation. I went on to point out that there would be instances when it would be to our economic advantage to exploit conventional power rather than nuclear power. I stressed that we, in the Commission regard nuclear power as an important supplement to hydroelectric and fossil fuel sources of power.

Sincerely,

(Signed) GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, APRIL 20, 1966

Mr. DAVIS. Doctor, when we are confronted with large expenditures for development of hydroelectric power I am sure that we all get a great deal of mail from people who say that this is ridiculous, that in 5 years this power will be developed from nuclear sources. Why spend a half billion dollars to build a new dam on the Columbia River?

What would be your comment?

Dr. SEABORG. It would depend on the particular situation. I think that there are certainly instances when it is to our economic advantage to exploit our hydroelectric power potential. The hydroelectric power potential, however, is limited, and once we have exploited it to the maximum we will still need additional electric power due to this high growth which I indicated. Hydro cannot take care of the whole load in the years ahead, and for this reason we will need the development of nuclear power in all of its aspects. Continued application of the presently economic water cooled reactors and then the application in the future of the advanced converter and breeder reactors are all concurrent with an increased use of fossil fuels to meet this large growing demand for electricity.

Mr. DAVIS. Can you foresee in the foreseeable future a substantial substitution of nuclear power as a source of eletcric power for the conventional and hydroelectric sources of power that we now have?

Dr. SEABORG. Not for many years. I don't look at it as a substitution. I look at it as a supplement of the fossil fuel source.

In a number of decades, however, when fossil fuel plants wear out and the question arises as to how they might be replaced it might be a matter of substitution. However, that is a number of decades from now. For many decades I look at it as a matter of nuclear power supplementing the hydro and the fossil fuel sources of electricity.

Mr. DAVIS. Then when people tell us, at least within your foresight, that we do not need particular sources of hydroelectric power, this is not in accordance with the practical situation as you see it?

Dr. SEABORG. That is right. I can see a number of situations where it is to our country's economic advantage to exploit a source of hydroelectric power.

Dr. TAPE. There are also some technical differences in the sense that the nuclear plant likes to run continuously for long periods of time and feed base load requirements. There are certain hydroplants where it may be difficult, due to seasonal variations and water supply and other reasons, for them to operate in quite that way. Thus a hydroplant furnishing the peaks of demand, coupled with other plants that might be furnishing the base load, would make excellent combinations.

As the chairman said, you cannot categorically say one way or the other. You literally have to look at them on a case-by-case basis.

The true conservationist, and I mean with respect to conserving our energy resources, would like to see every bit of energy taken from every drop of water as it runs to the sea in the same sense we would like to see every drop of energy taken from a drop of uranium ore that comes from the ground. I can see real advantages of considering hydroplants from the energy conservation point of view and from the point of view of integrating it into the overall power system.

Dr. SEABORG. But economics come into it in both cases because there are some cases where, as you begin to get to the end of your supply of hydropower, you will need to draw the line and it will not be economically sensible to use every drop of water that is on its way to the ocean.

Mr. DAVIS. I think you have made the point. The people who in effect tell us that we should not be developing any hydroelectric sources of power at the present time because you and your people are going to be making this power available from nuclear sources at a very economic rate in the immediate future—this is simply not your judgment of the situation at all?

Dr. SEABORG. I would not make that kind of a categorical statement at all.

A Raid on Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago majority members here in the House badly twisted arms and rammed an increase in parcel post rates that was tied to expansion of that Post Office Department operation through the House. Columnist John Chamberlain, writing for the King Features, properly described this as a raid on private enterprise, and I insert his column in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

A RAID ON PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

(By John Chamberlain)

Not so long ago the Post Office decided to get out of the banking business. The reason for this was that it was duplicating saving and insurance services that were being more efficiently performed by private institutions. But now, quite perversely, Postmaster General Larry O'Brien is making a determined pitch to put the Post Office into competition with free enterprise in another field that is currently being served quite adequately by private businessmen.

Specifically, the Post Office is seeking congressional authority to double the weight limits of objects carried in its parcel post business. It would also more than double the cubic-foot content. The original reason for the parcel post was to help country people avoid costly trips to town for objects that could be conveniently carried by postal employes.

The more bulky and heavier "freight-type" objects were left to the common carriers, who were the heirs to the tradition of the Pony Express and the old Wells-Fargo freight forwarding business. Practically speaking, this now means the Railway Express Agency, which has been maintained ever since the 1920's by the railroads to serve some 20,000 communities both in the United States and abroad. The REA boasts that it carries anything "from an emerald to an elephant," and it has been doing its job responsibly and well, and at no cost to the taxpayer.

Larry O'Brien does not say that the REA and smaller private shipment companies haven't been doing a good job. He simply wants more business for the Post Office of a type that would, as he thinks, permit it to increase its own net revenue.

There is, of course, more than meets the eye in the proposed bill to divert bulky parcel shipments from private carriers to the already over-burdened Post Office. The fight, actually, is between two segments of the private enterprise community. On the one hand, the big mail order houses stand to benefit by O'Brien's proposed change. Local merchants would lose. As things are now constituted, you can't get a stepladder or a lawnmower delivered to you by mail.

In the normal course of events a person will go to a local shopping center for such objects, and the merchant will arrange for delivery if necessary. But if lawnmowers or ladders could be moved by Government parcel post, the mail order companies would, in effect, be getting a big lift from the Government. Cynics have observed that O'Brien, who was one of President Kennedy's famed "Irish Mafia," is not unmindful of the desirability of political support from mail order tycoons.

The fear of the Railway Express Agency is that it will be forced out of business if O'Brien has his way in Congress. If nobody cares about railroad stockholders, it should be observed that some labor leaders are on the REA side of the fight.

C. L. Dennis, president of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, AFL–CIO, has said that "along with REA's destruction will be the jobs of 40,000 employees, many of whom have devoted years of their lives in helping to develop the carrier's service. There is involved more than $200 million in annual wages . . . REA Express now uses the services of some 71 standard railroads and of approximately 21 short-line railroads . . . also 37 U.S. domestic air lines."

Presumably, any displaced personnel could be hired by the Post Office. O'Brien has promised as much. But they would lose all seniority benefits. And you and I, as the taxpayers, would be responsible for the wages of all those Government employees.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent publication asserted:

> No nation is any greater than its agriculture permits it to be.

There is a great deal of truth in this statement. I believe that many of my fellow Congressmen have become aware of this fact in recent months. Those of us who represent this Nation's highly efficient and productive agricultural States have been aware of this truth throughout our lifetimes. The only change of mind we have experienced relative to our knowledge of the essential role agriculture plays in this Nation's economic well-being is one of increased devotion to the cause of the American farmer and heightened respect for his productivity.

As our Nation has shifted to an era of migration from the farm to the city, many of our citizens have all too often forgotten the farmer. When drought has stricken large sections of our food-producing lands, the city dweller in nonagricultural areas has given it only passing notice. For the city dweller has become so accustomed to the shelves of plenty supplied by the American farmer, that he knows despite the loss of millions of bushels of food, he shall not want for his next meal.

We in America have been truly blessed with an abundant food supply. That blessing has been so extensive that too many have been willing to take it for granted. In failing to respectfully recognize the farmer for vital role he plays in keeping American stomachs filled and American bodies nourished the general public has all too often done him a great disservice.

When the price of food has gone up many have been too ready and too willing to caustically assail the farmer. They have chided him for his complaints of not receiving a fair price. They felt sure they were correct in doing so because they considered it obvious that he was receiving substanitial income from the additional money they were spending for food.

Some doubted our contentions that though the consumer was paying 33 percent more for food in 1965 that in 1947–49, the farmer was receiving 10 percent less for his product than in 1947–49. I, and several of my fellow Congressmen from agricultural States have done our best to tell the farmer's story throughout the land this year. Our story has been a simple one—the American farmer, rather than being the principal cause, is in reality the victim of inflation. I feel the farmer's story told in recent months has been communicated well. I think the American public has learned a lesson in agriculture and I sincerely hope that lesson can be cast indelibly in the minds of all consumers.

Steadfast in his purpose, undaunted in his willingness to nourish the soul of our countrymen, and determined to blanket this country's fertile lands with abundance, the American farmer has met the challenge of hunger that has throughout history plagued man with sorrow and death. Not only has he met the challenge of this Nation, but he has contributed substantially to meeting the challenge of hunger throughout the world. I know, you know, and the American people know that the farmer will continue to meet this challenge.

Let us now resolve in this period of history when the eyes of the Nation have focused on the American farmer, to pay him his due respect, to assure him of our support and confidence and to pledge him the heartfelt thankfulness he so justly deserves.

How Long Will the War on Poverty Last?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the innovator of the war against poverty in modern times was the Emperor Napoleon III. After his exile, he continued to write about this favorite subject in London. But even Napoleon III had the intent of ending poverty in his country, France.

We had understood this was the intent here too—to end poverty yesterday if not tomorrow in the United States of America, to wipe it out, to eliminate it. Alas, this does not seem to be the true intent of this administration.

For Lyndon B. Johnson has allowed the Office of Economic Opportunity to buy a vast array of new office equipment. Included are such items as electric typewriters, file cabinets, film cameras, and a host of others. This monumental acquisition of shiny new supplies for the sumptuous offices of those directing the war on poverty can only mean, I submit, that the President and his aids expect our poverty war to go on a long, long time. I only hope that the purchase of adding machines does not mean that in the back of the high command's mind is the thought of adding to the number of poor.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Veterans' Administration, and the Post Office, all agencies which have proved they can, given the chance, produce, have been ordered to cut new equipment to the minimum. The Army in Vietnam may have 29 items in short supply in the Vietnam war area as reported by a Senate committee.

But Sargent Shriver's chair-borne home command is now adding to its record of having stamp lickers getting $50-a-day record salaries, the best and newest machines for their war in which the poor are often the chief sufferers.

I would suggest that if the President does not intend the war on poverty to go on forever, he might at least order the new machines for the permanent agencies and let Sargent Shriver's circus employ their used equipment. Or maybe the money could even go to help the poor.

Peter Schoemann Honored by Wisconsin State Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Wisconsin delegation to Congress participated in a luncheon meeting at the Congressional Hotel at which the Wisconsin State Society presented its first annual Citizenship Award to Peter Schoemann, president of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada, a distinguished son of the State of Wisconsin.

I am happy to insert in the RECORD at this point, a report of the proceedings on that occasion:

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS FOR AWARD PRESENTATION OF THE WISCONSIN STATE SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON, D.C., TO MR. PETER T. SCHOEMANN, GENERAL PRESIDENT, UNITED ASSOCIATION OF JOURNEYMEN AND APPRENTICES OF THE PLUMBING AND PIPE FITTINGS INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 13, 1966

(Mr. Jerome O. Hendrickson, President, Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D.C., presiding)

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The invocation will be delivered by Bishop Tanner.

Bishop TANNER. For the invocation today I have chosen the Blessing of St. Benedict: Oh Thou who clothest the lilies and feedest the birds of the sky, who leadest the lambs to the pasture and the heart to the waterside, who has multipied loaves and fishes and converted water into wine, do Thou come to our table as Guest and Giver to dine.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. We are happy to see you today. I want to read some communications:

John Cosgrove, Assistant Director in the Executive Office of the President, Office of Emergency Planning wrote as follows:

"Dear Mr. Hendrickson: I deeply appreciate the invitation of the Wisconsin State Society to honor Mr. Peter T. Schoemann on the occasion of the presentation of the Distinguished Citizenship Award to him on July 13, 1966.

"I regret that I cannot be with you. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than joining in so deserved a recognition. I worked with Mr. Schoemann in his capacity of Chairman of the Standing Constitutional Committee on Education of the AFL–CIO, and know of his contributions to education in general and the National Defense Education Act in particular. His dedication, integrity and qualities of leadership continue to be an inspiration to all of us who have the privileges of associating with him in whatever capacity.

"Please extend my regrets and cordial best wishes to Mr. Schoemann on this important occasion."

I also would like to read a telegram from the Staff of the Milwaukee Labor Press:

"Our best wishes on being designated Wisconsin's most outstanding national labor leader. May God continue to bless your future endeavors as he has in the past."

I would like to make some introductions:

Mr. James P. Schoemann, the son of the man we are honoring this afternoon. Jim Schoemann is the Administrator of the International Training Fund, a joint labor management trust which extends financial and technical assistance for the apprentice and journeyman training of the plumbers and pipefitters;

Congressman Robert W. Kastenmeier, Representative of the 2nd District of Wisconsin;

Andrew J. Biemiller of Milwaukee, former member of our Wisconsin Congressional Delegation and currently Legislative Director of the AFL–CIO;

John Loomis, a Vice President of the Wisconsin State Society and former General Counsel of the Agency for International Development;

William F. Schnitzler, Secretary-Treasurer of the AFL–CIO and a colleague of our honored guest. He is on the AFL–CIO Council;

The Treasurer of the Wisconsin State Society, Charlotte Norris;

Casey Ireland, Secretary of the Wisconsin State Society;

Congressman Lynn E. Stalbaum, from the 1st District of Wisconsin;

Charles Donahue, Solicitor of the Department of Labor and former Research Director of the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters;

Congressman John A. Race from the 6th District of Wisconsin;

The Most Reverend Bishop Paul F. Tanner, native son of Milwaukee and the General Secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference;

The Honorable John F. Henning, Undersecretary of Labor;

Congressman Henry S. Ruess, past President of the Wisconsin State Society and Representative of the 5th District.

We had expected to have with us today at the head table Mr. Martin J. Ward, General Secretary-Treasurer of the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters, who was regrettably called away to Chicago yesterday by the untimely death of his father.

My Executive Committee directed that this presentation ceremony be bipartisan, and we are very fortunate to have received acceptances from the two Wisconsin Members of the House of Representatives who have the longest term of service for their respective parties.

Our Democratic Representative is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. It is my distinct pleasure to present Representative Clement J. Zablocki, Representative from the 4th District of Wisconsin.

Mr. Zablocki. Thank you, Mr. Hendrickson.

Your Excellency, Bishop Tanner, our Honored Guest, my Colleagues, distinguished guests, this is truly a great privilege for me to be able to say a few words today as the Wisconsin State Society honors one of America's outstanding labor leaders and a fine son of Wisconsin, Peter T. Schoemann.

Knowing you as I do—your vast energies, your broad range of interests and your searching intellect—it is not easy to select one or two topics to dwell on in the few minutes alloted to me.

Since this week in Congress we are considering the Foreign Aid Bill, I think it appropriate to dwell briefly on the contributions which Pete Schoemann and the American labor movement are making to American policies and programs abroad.

As you all know, the AFL–CIO has supported the President 100 percent on Vietnam and our efforts to block communist aggression there and everywhere.

Pete Schoemann has been one of the most outspoken of our labor leaders on this subject. He has frequently stated his support for President Meany's vigorous anti-communist stance on the part of American labor in international labor circles. Among labor leaders from other nations he has been a constant, effective proponent of U.S. policies.

To me, Pete Schoemann represents the dedication to the American way of life of the labor movement in this country.

Communism, as you know, has classically aimed its appeals at the workers of the world, promising them a paramount place in their "new society."

American labor has rejected these blandishments and, for the most part, has refused even to toy with the suggestion that there might be something to gain under communism.

At the same time, our trade unions have been in the forefront of the free labor movement of the world. They have tried to impress upon the workers in other countries the benefits which can be obtained through participation in a democratic system.

In short, Pete Schoemann and other American labor leaders have not been content to be merely anti-communist. Rather, they have made, and are making, vigorous efforts to promote free institutions abroad which can act as a bulwark against Marxist philosophies, and rarely has any effort had such success as that undertaken by the labor movement.

For example, the Foreign Aid Bill now before the House contains a provision for assisting labor's efforts at providing low-cost housing for workers in Latin America.

American labor has invested millions of dollars and much time and effort in demonstrating U.S. techniques for building, financing and marketing privately developed housing. In doing so our trade unions have helped alleviate a crying need for decent housing for Latin American workers.

But Pete Schoemann can tell you much more about this labor program than I can. He has been in the forefront of these efforts, as he has been in the forefront of other progressive projects of American labor.

Because of his leadership, Pete has gained tremendous respect here on Capitol Hill and in the Executive agencies downtown. He has become well known in the past few years as one of the most vocal and effective spokesmen for the labor movement.

His fellow plumber and pipefitters are all indeed fortunate to have such an able leader, and a man who is unafraid to speak out courageously on those public issues which touch the welfare of his own membership and the entire labor movement.

It is our hope that this Citizenship Award from your fellow Wisconsinites will—in some measure—express the general recognition which exists in Washington for the fine contribution which you, Pete Schoemann, are making to the labor movement and the progress of our nation.

Congratulations!

Mr. Hendrickson. Now, we are privileged to call upon Representative Alvin E. O'Konski, of the 10th District of Wisconsin.

Mr. O'Konski. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests and my colleagues in the House: After the very appropriate remarks made by Clem, I think that any words will merely be supplementary to the wonderful thoughts that he has expressed.

It is a great privilege for me, Pete, to be here and to take part in the ceremonies honoring your great service and your great contribution.

Just because we are honoring and awarding you today doesn't mean we are asking you to quit and to give up. You are still young in spirit, you are still young in heart, and you still look young.

Pete, people of America, people of Wisconsin, and people of the world I think have good memories of your dedicated services to mankind.

You know it is an accomplishment to be singled out in your life for a single accomplishment. It is an honor to be designated as a great labor leader and to be designated so in one field. That in itself is honor enough. But when you have a man who is singled our not only for his contribution to labor but for his contribution to another field of activity, then I think that is a real achievement and real accomplishment.

Peter is known in the field of education for his accomplishment in that field just as he is known for his accomplishment and achievement in the field of labor.

There are hundreds of thousands of young people in America today who are enjoying the privilege of education because Pete was a forerunner in that field. Because Pete felt what good does it do to bring all these emoluments to labor if they don't have the privileges and benefits of getting the fruits of that labor, namely, getting their children adequate education.

One of the reasons the United States of America ranks as high as it does in the field of vocational education is because of the pioneering spirit and the tenacity of Pete Schoemann over here the man we are honoring today. He started in the State of Wisconsin where he is not only known as a labor leader but as a leader in education as well.

Incidentally, I first heard about Pete Schoemann not about the labor movement, I heard about his work in the field of education in Wisconsin. He was on the school board of Milwaukee. I believe he is the only living—or dead—citizen of Wisconsin who has been honored by three governors of three different parties. Ordinarily most states have only two parties. We have three. Wisconsin always offers more.

But here was a man singly honored not by one governor of one party but honored by three governors of the State of Wisconsin that needed his consultation and work and his effort in the field of education.

I just want to say to be recognized in the world for just one achievement is a good thing but when a man is recognized for the things you have done in the field of education, besides the things you have done in the field of the labor movement, it is a double honor.

I am privilege indeed to stand before these people and pay tribute to you and pay you honor. You deserve it. No man deserves it more.

Apart from his direct activities within the labor movement, Pete Schoemann's favorite extracurricular activity—if I may call it that—has certainly been his interest in education; and this is of particular interest to me as a former teacher.

Many years ago, when he chose to become active in politics in Milwaukee, his interest in education led him to choose membership on the school board as a target of his efforts. He was a member of the Milwaukee Board of School Directors for 21 years and was twice president of the Board.

His involvement has included all kinds of education, both academic and vocational, and at all levels.

For 18 years, he was a member of the Wisconsin State Board of Vocational Education, serving under Wisconsin governors of three different political parties. He was also president of the Board for seven years.

Long before he came to Washington, then, in order to take over as president of his own international union, Pete Schoemann had captured the spirit of organized labor's traditional spirt of as much education as possible, and for as many people as possible, in the United States.

President Meaney of the AFL–CIO made an excellent choice in selecting Pete Schoemann to be the Chairman of the AFL–CIO Committee on Education, in which capacity he often appears before committees of both Houses of Congress to present the AFL–CIO's position on various education bills.

Once upon a time, it seemed that the barriers to eventual passage of federal aid to primary and secondary education were practically insuperable. Those barriers have finally been broken down, and for this achievement, the school community—the school boards, the supervisors, and the teachers—owe a lasting debt of gratitude to their friends in the American trade union movement who kept up the fight year after year and never gave up in the face of what amounted at times to very discouraging odds. This persevering and very effective assistance is personified in labor leaders like Pete Schoemann who long ago recognized that it would profit little to achieve better wages and shorter hours and improved working conditions for themselves, if they could not help their children prepare for a richer and fuller life than they themselves had known.

Peter Schoemann's dedication to improvement of the educational system has always been reflected in his constant efforts to improve the quality of apprenticeship training for members of his own union. The high value he has placed on continuous training for skilled craftsmen has resulted directly in new and improved programs of training for journeyman members of his union as well.

Today, the apprentice and journeyman training system of the United Association of Plumbers and Pipe Fitters in conjunction with employers at both the national and local level is rightfully considered one of the very best, if not the best, in this country.

Two characteristics of Pete Schoemann's fight for bigger and better apprenticeship programs deserve mention. One is his resistance to substitute methods of training in the form of spot training in some few skills of the trade for a shorter period of time than the full five years which his craft requires. Secondly, there has been his insistence that apprenticeship and journeyman training are primarily matters for joint labor-management determination and control; and that while government assistance is welcome and profitable and even deserved, the nation's various systems of apprenticeship training must never become comprehended into, and consumed by, an overall governmental manpower program.

By way of proving this latter point, his international union under his direction has established in conjunction with large interstate or national construction firms a very interesting trust arrangement known as the International Training Fund. Although, in the construction industry, apprenticeship is locally directed and locally financed in the first instance, it is the role of this Fund to assist local training programs through direct financial grants, and also by maintaining a corps of five full-time technical experts in the field whose job is to help local apprentice committees improve the quality of their training. I understand that this International Training Fund has made grants totalling more than $8 million in the ten years it has been in existence, and that all of this money was contributed in the first place by employers of union plumbers and pipefitters.

This emphasis on the rightful place of private enterprise in the total American scheme of things is an example of Pete Schoemann's political and social philosophy. The American trade union movement today is distinguished from labor organizations in many foreign countries by the fact that it believes in the fundamentals of the capitalistic or private enterprise system. Pete Schoemann, however, is one of those American labor leaders who stands out by being unafraid to say just that; that is, he is not content to give lip service to such things as private ownership of the means of production, competition in the market place, and the right of business owners to a fair profit, while relying largely on government initiative to solve our big social problems. He frequently speaks out on the rightful role of business and labor in solving some of these problems, not merely as following the leadership of public officials, but sometimes as taking the initiative.

Lastly, any tribute to Pete Schoemann at this time from a Republican would be incomplete without mentioning his outspoken insistence just within this past year upon greater political independence for the labor movement. Labor has always maintained a formal or technical kind of political neutrality, and every now and then supports a Republican. I myself am very proud of the constant and loyal support I have received from union members and their chosen leaders in my own congressional district. Sometimes though, we are led to believe that it is almost futile for a Republican member of Congress to vote for what he conscientiously believes is the real welfare of the working men and women of this country, because his Democratic opponent in the next general election is sure to take what is sometimes called a more "liberal" stand on certain issues, and this alone will be sufficient to win him the endorsement of the labor movement.

Pete Schoemann has lately pointed out, in connection with the fate of the 14(b) repeal and the situs picketing bill, that "liberal" and "pro-labor" do not always mean the same thing. I believe this point is very, very well taken and heartily recommend this consideration to other leaders in the trade union movement. I believe we are beginning to see the signs of an awakening to this political truth. I believe we saw that during the AFL–CIO Executive Council meeting this past winter down in Miami. I believe we saw that also during the National Legislative Conference of the Building and Construction Trades Department held here in Washington this past March. Most assuredly, liberal and pro-labor are not the same thing, and they who are mostly intent upon securing enactment of a long list of welfare programs are not necessarily they who recognize the need for legislation that will stimulate organizing initiative on the part of labor and enable labor to better serve the welfare of its membership at the bargaining table.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. At this time I would like to call upon Congressman HENRY REUSS of the 5th District to make a special presentation to our distinguished guest.

Mr. REUSS. Thank you very much.

Reverend Clergy, colleagues, brothers and sisters: Wisconsin is illustrious for its cheese, renowned throughout the world for its beer, but there is nothing of which it is prouder than its great, clean, progressive labor movement. And no man has brought more luster to that movement than that peerless plumber, that sterling steamfitter, that genial journeyman, Pete Schoemann.

A lot of us in Milwaukee, when Pete left for bigger things in Washington a dozen years ago, were fearful that this might go to Pete's head, that he would forget his old friends in Wisconsin and the problems of Wisconsin. But as the history of the last dozen years demonstrates, he has not forgotten us. And we have not forgotten you, Peter.

I have the privilege of presenting on behalf of the Wisconsin State Society to you, Peter, a flag of the United States which has flown over the United States Capitol. If anyone doubts that fact, I have in this packet a letter duly signed and subscribed to by J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol, saying it has flown over the West Wing of the Capitol. It may be the last flag ever to fly over it. [Laughter.]

I know, because the love of your country has been your great philosophical characteristic all your life, that this flag will ripple proudly over the Schoemann home and illuminate your love for your country—and I hope, sir, remind you that Wisconsin loves you.

On behalf of the Wisconsin State Society I proudly present this flag to you.

Mr. SCHOEMANN. Thank you very much.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Some months ago the Wisconsin State Society thought it would be an excellent idea to have a suitable award or citation to confer deserved public recognition on distinguished citizens of our State. We felt that since we were the Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D.C., that our recipient should be a person who has distinguished himself in some way, both in our home State and also here in the Greater Washington Area.

The man we selected to receive our Distinguished Citizenship Award certainly fills the bill on both counts. He was a leading citizen of the City of Milwaukee and the state of Wisconsin, not only in his chosen field of labor union leadership, but in a number of other civic activities as well. He left all that behind to come here to Washington to become a top executive official of his own international union. His union, The United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of The Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry, has been known for many years as an organization which was willing to try bold new experiments in labor management relations. It is a union which in the past has been in the habit of producing national leaders. Among its members have been numbered the late Senator Patrick V. McNamara from our neighboring State of Michigan, who passed away just this year; also, the late Martin P. Durkin from another of our neighboring states, Illinois, who was Mr. Schoemann's predecessor as president of the union and the first Secretary of Labor under President Eisenhower. Another outstanding member of the same union is Mr. George Meany, the first and until now the only president of America's merged labor federation, the AFL–CIO.

I would like to mention also that we are most happy to have with us today still another of Mr. Schoemann's fellow union members, Mr. James A. Brownlow, who until his retirement was president of the Metal Trades Department, AFL–CIO.

For the rest, I think I will let this scroll tell its own story.

The scroll says: "The Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D.C. Presents to Peter T. Schoemann its Distinguished Citizenship Award.

"Whereas Peter T. Schoemann is a native son of the State of Wisconsin, having been born in the City of Milwaukee, where he received his formal education and his apprenticeship training in his chosen calling, the plumbing trade; and

"Whereas he labored faithfully at that trade in Milwaukee for many years; and

"Whereas he answered the call of his brother journeyman plumbers to serve their interests as an officer of Plumbers Local Union 75 of Milwaukee for eighteen years; and

"Whereas he occupied an influential role in building up the city of Milwaukee by serving as President of the Milwaukee Building and Construction Trades Council for some twenty years; and

"Whereas he was not content to confine his abilities and influence to his home town alone, but played an active role also in his international union, serving as an elected official of that body from 1928 continuously to date; and

"Whereas dearly as he loved the labor movement, he was unwilling to allow it to become the sole focus of his attention, but instead devoted himself to the general welfare of his fellow Wisconsonites by serving on, and sometimes chairing, such bodies as the Milwaukee Board of School Directors, the Wisconsin State Board of Vocational Education, and the Housing Authority of the City of Milwaukee; and

"Whereas in 1955, he was chosen General President of one of America's largest and most influential trade unions, the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada, a position to which he has been twice re-elected unanimously by conventions of that body; and

"Whereas in the exercise of his high office, he has given the American trade union movement a constant and faithful example of wisdom, courage and administrative excellence; and

"Whereas he has never allowed his necessary involvement in large national and international issues to cause him to forget that the welfare of his brothers is grounded upon protection of his union's work jurisdiction and continuous training; and

"Whereas he was most instrumental in preserving and reshaping the National Joint Board for the Settlement of Jurisdictional Disputes in the Building and Construction Industry, for the purpose of keeping intra-industry disputes in private hands where they belong; and

"Whereas he has encouraged and promoted the extension and improvement of apprenticeship training, the only adequate form of training for preparing a journeyman to work at his trade; and

"Whereas under his guidance, the United Association cooperated with national construction firms to establish the International Training Fund, an altogether unique institution for the purpose of providing financial and technical assistance to training programs for apprentices and journeymen; and

"Whereas by establishing the International Training Fund, both the United Association, under his leadership, and the national construction firms have provided a model which other skilled crafts may well follow in training the craftsmen needed by American industry, thereby saving American taxpayers millions of dollars annually; and

"Whereas as a Vice President of the AFL–CIO, he has fought a vigorous campaign for an American labor movement, whose affiliates are unified in purpose and free to pursue their individual members' needs; and

"Whereas his ability and interest in international labor affairs have led to his twice being appointed as a labor advisor to International Labor Organization conferences, and as an AFL–CIO delegate to a Congress of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions; and

"Whereas his knowledge, skill and authority within the labor movement have caused him to be named to such bodies as the Atomic Energy Commission, Labor Management Advisory Commitee, the National Manpower Advisory Committee, the Advisory Committee on Vocational Education, and the Missile Sites Labor Commission; and

"Whereas in all of his service to various private and public interests, he has kept steadfastly before him the truth that labor is not the same thing as government, while business is different from both; so that while he has shown a capacity for tempering private demands in the light of public necessity, he has refused to equate labor statesmanship with a forgetfulness of the needs of those who elected him to union office; and

"Whereas especially by this means, he has provided an example of leadership that is a bulwark of American democracy, wherein the state is not the whole of Society; and

"Whereas he has, for all the causes above recited, reflected glory and honor upon his native State of Wisconsin, and endeared, himself to his fellow Wisconsinites who now reside in Washington, D.C.: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That on this thirteenth day of July, in the year of our Lord the nineteen hundred and sixty-sixth, and of the statehood of Wisconsin the one hundred and eighteenth, the Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D.C. hereby confers its Distinguished Citizenship Award upon Peter T. Schoemann, with all the rights and privileges consequent thereto."

Mr. Schoemann. Most Reverend Bishop Tanner, Honorable Congressmen, Mr. Toastmaster, Members of the Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D. C., my Colleagues and Friends:

I am deeply grateful for this honor you have paid me, and I cannot tell you how much pleasure it gives me to accept this award here in the company of so many friends from the labor movement and from the State of Wisconsin, with whom I have been associated for many years.

It is a special honor to accept this award from my two good friends of many years standing, the distinguished Congressmen who have the highest seniority rank among members of their respective parties in our Wisconsin congressional delegation, Clem Zablocki and Al O'Konski. Both of them are friends of the working people of this country, and both have stood up time and time again to be counted on issues where the welfare of all our citizens was at stake.

Incidentally, the same goes for the man who earlier made the presentation of the flag that flew over the Capitol, that dedicated and very able Representative from Milwaukee, Henry Reuss.

Thank you too for all the good wishes for a successful convention which so many of you have expressed to me here today.

I am especially pleased by those words in the scroll which say that labor statesmanship is not the same thing as forgetfulness of those who elect you to office. When you say statesmanship, you immediately suggest the relation of the individual citizen to the state and government at various levels, and you also suggest the relation of the individual to his community at various levels. There are situations where the overriding concerns of the larger community require us to curb our own particular aims and ambitions, but we do not always arrive at the goal by forgetting our own special interests from the very beginning. I wonder whether we have not become so cynical in our view of certain things which go on here on Capitol Hill, for example that we miss the deeper meaning in a complex process that makes our American democracy work.

Thus, labor unions, business interests, farm interests, the school lobby and all the rest are often described as pressure groups for special pleaders. Statesmanship for their representatives is supposed to consist in forgetting their own special aims to take the broader, general welfare viewpoint.

In the field of economics, we once had the unseen hand of Adam Smith. The theory was that, if everyone sought his own maximum gain most selfishy, then by the operation of an unseen hand the selfishness of all would produce the greatest good for all. During the years of the Great Depression, if not before that, we finally learned that the hand was not only not seen, it simply wasn't there.

Could it be that the pendulum has now swung too far in the opposite direction? Could we be missing the important lesson that the general welfare is sometimes very well served by those seeking their own private interest, that sometimes it cannot be well served in any other way?

So, the better job one makes of his own talents and his own possibilities, the more he has to contribute to the general welfare.

Furthermore, proposals made in the name of public interest are not always what they claim to be, and unless they are subjected to the criticism which spring from private interest, what we could end up with is a great collection of foolishness enacted in the name of the general welfare. Special pleaders then serve as devil's advocates to make our public-spirited servants prove their case.

Perhaps our great public policy debates are somewhat similar to the situation we have in a courtroom. The judge is there to serve the administration of justice, but so are the lawyers for the plaintiff and the defendant. The judge does it by being an impartial judge; the lawyers do it by being the most persuasive advocates they can be for their own respective clients. To get the whole job done, we need the impartial judicial decision of the judge, and we also need the special pleading of the attorneys for both sides. For one thing, justice cannot be served unless the litigating parties get everything that is coming to them, and to get that they have to fight for it. For another, on a given question it can happen that the judge is wrong while one of the special pleaders might be right.

And so it happens that our private groups can serve the general welfare by making out the best case they can for their own special interest. Since the start of this year, a number of such issues have come up involving my own and other unions.

One such issue is that of the wage guidelines we are supposed to be acting in the public interest if we keep negotiated wage gains within the guidelines, and contrary to the public interest if we exceed them. But is it in the public interest, given our free enterprise economic system, for labor organizations to bow their heads meekly to a decision in which they had no opportunity to participate, and which is dictated unilaterally by an agency of the government? I say no, not of the whole government, but only of its administrative branch. Much the same can be said of business firms on the question of price decisions that are made.

Another such issue would be the relation of federal manpower policy to the institution of craft apprenticeship. It is alleged that apprenticeship, in its present state, cannot provide the skilled craftsmen needed by American industry, and that therefore those who sponsor apprenticeship should permit and even encourage the establishment of every sort of less-than-apprenticeship training program. To do so is said to be in the public interest, and to obstruct the new development, so it is argued, can proceed only from motives of selfishness.

Our argument with this position is that its wisdom does not equal its sincerity. It overlooks the truth that even now many gain entrance to the skilled crafts without apprenticeship preparation, and that some of them do not survive very long; that many of those who leave the skilled trades were not totally without training, but rather did have some kind of vocational school or technical institute training, approximately the equivalent of what they would receive under many of these manpower training proposals.

To take another example, the racial issue is indeed a serious national issue, and the achievement of full racial equality and racial justice would be a precious national asset. But have we not other precious national assets which need not be torn up and consigned to the rubbish heap for the sake of solving this one problem in social justice? The school system which does not discriminate on racial grounds would be a precious national asset, but so—I would argue—is the neighborhood school, provided it is not used as a cover-up for discrimination. It is good and right that our society provide everyone a full and fair opportunity to work at the occupation of his choice, but so is the requirement that a person make some effort on his own part to obtain the occupation that he chooses to follow.

While there is a selfishness and a self-centeredness that is disruptive of the community, so is there a well-regulated love of one's own self and one's own group, and a socially necessary campaign for self-interest, both personal and collective.

Again, I want to express my appreciation to the officers and members of the Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D.C., and to everyone here present who has played a part, large or small, in these various activities that are recorded in this handsome scroll you have presented to me, and that was made possible by my activity in my labor organization that I love so dearly.

This scroll will occupy a place of honor in my office and be a constant reminder in my few remaining years of the inspiration and encouragement I have received over these many years from my fellow Wisconsinites.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Hendrickson. At this time I would like to call on Honorable John F. Henning, Undersecretary of Labor.

Mr. Henning. Mr. Chairman, Friends: I am honored to be here in joining in this tribute to Pete Schoemann.

The mere mention of the name Wisconsin recalls some of the great progressive traditions of American political life. In fact, I think we can agree that in the years between the turn of the century and the First World War, Wisconsin was perhaps the most enlightened, the most active of all the states in terms of social legislation.

Wisconsin was the first state in the union to acknowledge the coming of the Industrial Revolution and establish those industrial laws which would protect the worker against the abuses of the factory system. And it is only proper that a state with such traditions should honor Pete Schoemann.

Pete is President of one of the greatest trade unions of America. In fact, by family tradition I am compelled to say he is President of the greatest labor union in this nation.

Pete, I would meet another loyalty test. I must say that you head the second most skilled craft in America. The first, of course, being the lathers. The lathers of Los Angeles and Boston where Neil Haggerty worked his trade.

It is a great tribute that Wisconsin provides to Pete Schoemann today. It is a magnificent thing. Pete has given the great years of his adult life, the great productive years of his life, and he gives them still, to the national interest and the cause of the American worker. He has achieved wonders for the people he represents but above that he represents the independence and the integrity of the American trade union movement. Pete Schoemann and men like him have made the AFL–CIO the greatest trade union organization in the history of the free world.

Mr. Hendrickson. At this time I would like to call upon Congressman John A. Race for a presentation to our distinguished guest.

Mr. Race. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Honorable Bishop, Our Honorable Guest today, My Colleagues, Members of the Wisconsin State Society and Officers and Members of the different union organizations present.

Pete, it is a distinct honor to be with you today and I want to personally congratulate you. I feel very akin to you. I happen to have been a member of the Machinists for the past 25 years. I have served on the State Board of Adult Education of Wisconsin recently, and I see our background is similar. I don't think I will ever be a president of an international, but being a Member of Congress is another honor. I hope to stay here awhile.

I have a letter here, Pete, from the Wisconsin Congressional Delegation, which I would like to read:

"Mr. Peter T. Schoemann,
"*General President, United Association of Plumbers and Pipe Fitters, Washington, D.C.*

"Dear Peter: The Wisconsin Congressional Delegation wishes to take this occasion to thank you for the honor you have brought to our State, the Labor Movement, and the Nation.

"We know that you are one of the great leaders of the Labor Movement. We also know of your contribution in the field of education, both academic and vocational. For eighteen years you were a member of the Wisconsin State Board of Vocational Education serving under Wisconsin Governors of three different political parties.

"You believe that democracy demands wisdom of the average man. Without the exercise of wisdom, free institutions and personal liberty and inevitably imperiled. For this, we thank you.

"In the exercise of your high office, you have given the American Trade Union Movement a constant and faithful example of wisdom, courage, and foresight. You have imparted to the familiar language—what too many have come to treat as the cliches of Christianity—a new poignancy and vibrance. You did not do so by reciting them, but by proving that it is possible to live them.

"Because much work remains to be done, we hope that you will be with us a long time. The people of the Labor Movement need your services, the young people of America need your example of selfless dedication, and we need your friendship and counsel. We not only wish you success in your approaching Convention, we predict it.

"With kindest personal regards, we are
"Sincerely yours,
"Senator William Proxmire, The Honorable Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin, Congressman Lynn E. Stalbaum, Congressman Robert W. Kastenmeier, Congressman Vernon W. Thompson, Congressman Clement J. Zablocki, Congressman Henry S. Reuss, Congressman John A. Race, Congressman Melvin R. Laird, Congressman John W. Byrnes, Congressman Glenn R. Davis."

And also last but not least, the dean of our Congressional Delegation, "Congressman Alvin E. O'Konski."

Mr. Schoemann. Well, this is a very pleasant surprise. I am deeply moved and sincerely grateful to both Senators and all of the Congressmen from my home State for the kind sentiments and good wishes expressed in this letter.

And I am deeply pleased to accept it from such a fine, outstanding young Congressman as John Race. John may your performance during this 89th Congress mark the beginning of a long and successful career here in Washington. Thank you again.

Mr. Hendrickson. We have men from all walks of life and the labor movement with us. I would like to introduce a Federal Judge who is a member of the Wisconsin State Society, Jim Durfee.

I want to thank Bob Shafer, Charlotte Norris, Bob McMillen of the United Association who is on Pete Schoemann's staff, Larry Gilbertson, Past President and Awards Committee Chairman of the Society, Dick Nelson and John Loomis of the committee, as well as Carm Dye and Sukey Wray.

At this time I would like to close by calling on Bishop Tanner before he gives his benediction to tell us of a little sidelight on our honored guest.

Bishop Tanner. This will only take about a minute but it is a story that I think is important to illustrate Pete's character.

There aren't many people in this room who were adults in 1932, the black, desperate days of the depression. At that time I was in youth work in Milwaukee and we were graduating a class of about 75 union men from law school who could probably earn $75 a month any place in town. Pete gave them a talk and an opportunity which I regret to say they didn't take. It amounted to this: He wanted them to get jobs in a shop and not to mention they ever went to high school, and above all that they were graduated lawyers, but to work themselves up to be shop stewards and after that Pete would pull them up in the labor movement.

I have never forgotten it because in those days a union wasn't very popular and unions needed intelligent leadership. And Pete had the intelligence to offer it.

(Benediction).

Will Two Huge Power Dams Improve on Nature and Beautify the Grand Canyon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the advocates of building two huge power dams in the Grand Canyon are underestimating the Nation's devotion to its great natural heritage.

Proponents of the dams say that the miles-long reservoirs the dams would create are acceptable because they could not be seen from the most traveled highways or from the point where most people now look into the Grand Canyon.

In fact, motorists can reach the rim of the canyon at Toroweap only to look down—if the Bridge Canyon Dam is built—into a dead storage reservoir.

Recently I have noted a letter in the Arizona Republic, in which M. E. Bernard, of Phoenix, argues that areas of the Grand Canyon which are not usually seen by a majority of the visitors are fair game for destruction. "Tourists could care less," he says.

Sometimes this argument is carried a step further with the contention that the Grand Canyon would be enhanced by the two dams, creating easy boat access into the canyon for the multitudes.

This argument persists despite the known hazards of boating on reservoirs surrounded by the sheer walls of the canyon and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's assertion that no new recreational benefits can be expected from the dams.

In a letter to me of June 24, J. M. Clint of Phoenix says:

> I ask you what difference a rise of five or six hundred feet in the water level behind these dams will make in the canyon's natural beauty. I'll answer my own question and tell you that far from defacing or ruining or detracting from the beauty of the canyon, the lakes will improve and add to its grandeur. Envision it for a moment.

Yes, let us envision the difference between two manmade dams and their reservoirs and the natural canyon created by time and the river flowing.

Dams and reservoirs we can and do have in number. But the Grand Canyon is unique and irreplaceable.

Congress and the American people have committed themselves to the proposition that there are some parts of our country that should be preserved as nature made them—regardless of whether they are seen and visited by masses of people. Indeed, the preservation of some areas in their natural state requires that they not be developed for mass use. The Wilderness Act which Congress passed after long and careful consideration reflects a deep concern by Americans for what happens to the areas out of sight of the highways.

Americans have wisely decided to protect and preserve wild portions of our landscape. Let us make certain that the Grand Canyon, one of our greatest natural creations, is among them.

In claiming that the dams will beautify the Grand Canyon, it is clear that the proponents of the project are groping for arguments.

In order to present the full arguments contained in the letters I have mentioned, I include these letters hereafter.

I include also the letter of June Terrin, of Winslow, Ariz., who argues that unless the dams are built we may all starve. As is well known the proposed dams are in no way necessary to provide the additional water needed by the farmers, cities, and industry of Arizona.

EDITOR, the Arizona Republic:

Attention: Rep. HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat of Wisconsin:

Of all the millions who have seen the Grand Canyon, only a few hundred have seen more than the few miles of the Colorado River and then just a glimpse of it here and there. Most tourists see only a few spots that are near the hotel and main lookout points.

In their mad dash across Arizona on U.S. 66 they dash in from the Williams entrance and dash out the same way. Some have entered from the Cameron side which is on State 64 and a very interesting drive if one takes the time to stop now and then.

Thousands more have seen the canyon from the north rim.

However, tourists could care less if a dam was built below for they do not want to delay their trip to Las Vegas or to California, or to the old homestead back East.

So, it boils down to the old shell game in Washington: What's in it for me?

M. E. BERNARD.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
June 24, 1966.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: I just read in this morning's issue of the Arizona Republic that you had used "letters of protest" written to the local newspapers, by Arizona residents, against construction of the Bridge and Marble Canyon dams, to show a barrage of protests from Arizona residents.

There were letters of protest from some Arizona citizens against the construction of these dams, and if there was any way for you to investigate and learn, you'd discover they were all of the same stripe as the fanatics of the Sierra Club. You should also know too, that ninety-eight percent of the citizens of this state are for the dams and the resultant additional water they will eventually provide.

Now, about the argument of the Sierra Club that these dams will ruin the Grand Canyon. The contention is completely wrong; in fact the construction of the dams and formation of the lakes behind them will enhance the accessibility of the canyon by providing an easy boat-route to more points where its awesome grandeur can be observed and contemplated. Undoubtedly you are already aware that this canyon is a mile deep. I ask you what difference a rise of five or six hundred feet in the water level behind these dams will make in the canyon's natural beauty. I'll answer my own question and tell you that far from defacing or ruining or detracting from the beauty of the canyon, the lakes will improve and add to its grandeur. Envision it for a moment.

I'm as avid a conservationist as anyone, but I cannot agree with the intemperate accusations brought against this program. Any thinking person will immediately understand the great, and very great benefits to be realized by the human population of the west from the water and electric power provided. There is a definite shortage of both. And all of this and more from a project that will bring more beauty to the canyon rather than destroy it, as sometimes claimed.

I understand that most of your eastern rivers are becoming more noxious daily because of pollutants, both human and industrial, being dumped into them. I recommend this to you as a problem for your attack. I am confident you will have the fullest support of all our representatives in Washington.

Most sincerely,

J. M. CLINT.

EDITOR, THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC:

Mrs. E. B. Barnett (letter June 25) would disregard the needs of the farmer here in Arizona. After all, they are a mere 0.6 per cent of the population of Arizona. Let's just eliminate that group completely as her letter seems to suggest. And as she emphasizes, tourism is so much more important and we, in Arizona, can then depend completely on that industry.

But I would like to ask one small question. What does she propose we eat? Especially if all the other states decide Arizona has a good thing going and proceed to treat their farmers likewise.

JUNE TERRIN.

WINSLOW.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereo *(U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942)*.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

One Hundred Young Men Attending West Virginia's Fourth Annual National Youth Camp Hear President and Vice President During Tour of Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 15, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the annual National Youth Science Camp, a permanent outgrowth of the West Virginia centennial celebration in 1963, is held in scenic Pocahontas County, near Greenbank, W. Va. The camp is operated by the State of West Virginia and West Virginia University, and is under the direction of Charles N. Cochran, professor of mathematics at the university.

Each year two outstanding science-oriented young men represent each State at the camp. Delegates are selected on the basis of academic achievement and scientific knowledge.

Annually, the camp participants are brought to Washington to supplement the 3 weeks which are spent in camp activity ranging from work with computers and telescopes to group singing and sports participation.

This year's Washington visit was highlighted by two significant events on Wednesday—one a luncheon at which Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY addressed the 100 young men who were guests at the event over which I was privileged to preside. A number of Senators jointed us for the occasion and heard the Vice President remind that the wonders of science can be applied to create a better life for man.

We were also pleased to have had with us James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, both of whom have been our guest speakers in previous years.

Immediately following the luncheon, the students were transported to the navy yard where President Lyndon B. Johnson was dedicating a new research ship, the $9.2 million *Oceanographer*.

The President acknowledged the presence of the young men by referring to "the 100 outstanding high school science students who have joined us here today from all over the United States."

The President told them:

> I hope there are among you some of our oceanographers of tomorrow. You could not choose a more important and challenging career.

President and Mrs. Johnson greeted and talked with the campers individually. Certainly, it was a thrilling day for our young guests.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speeches of President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, NATIONAL YOUTH SCIENCE CAMP, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 13, 1966

I am glad to see you here sharing your interests and exchanging your knowledge.

Science brings men together. It has brought men together over the centuries—across the boundaries of nations, races and generations.

Today, in America, we see a spirit of creative cooperation fostered by the quest for scientific knowledge. One of the rewarding experiences that has come to me, as chairman of the Space Council, has been to see universities . . . the many departments of government . . . labor . . . large and small businesses all working together to achieve our common goal—mastery of space.

With this and other similar examples to serve as a model, we must try to harness our divergent and separated resources, and our energies, to solve the problems of our earthly environment—problems of housing, of health, of education, of transportation . . . yes, and problems too of defeating poverty, injustice and discrimination, and of keeping the peace.

These problems are of immense magnitude. But if we create the science needed, discover the relevant knowledge, apply the best technologies, and utilize all our resources, each of these problems turns into an exciting opportunity to make life better.

A mathematician told me recently that, in his field, if a man or woman did not contribute some significant result before age 30—it was too late.

While I think he may have been exaggerating for effect—he assured me he was not. He was an old fogey of 33.

The truth is that scientists in their 20's and 30's *are* in important positions in our scientific programs. I expect that in the nex tfew years I will be able to say the same to you.

It took mankind 200,000 years to emerge from the Stone Age.

It took another 10,000 years from the first use of metal tools to the Industrial Revolution, now hardly a century old.

Two key exhibits in our Smithsonian Institution vividly illustrate the dramatic acceleration in the tempo of progress. One is the first commercial computer, only 17 years old. The other is astronaut John Glenn's space capsule, only four years old, but already a museum piece.

If any age can lay claim to being a golden age of adventure and discovery, ours can. Yet we have barely begun.

Here are some of the developments we can look forward to within the next 20 years.

In agriculture, the large-scale use of desalinated sea water.

In medicine, the transplantation of natural organs and the use of artificial ones.

In psychiatry, the widespread application of drugs that control or modify the personality.

In education, the use of more sophisticated teaching machines.

In worldwide communication, the everyday employment of translating machines.

In industry, the extensive use of automation, up to and including some kinds of decision-making at the management level.

In space, the establishment of a permanent base upon the moon.

Some of you might say that there is nothing very surprising here. And you would be right.

Experience shows that it takes 10 to 30 years for a new idea to make its way from its inception in a scientist's mind to its general application in everyday life. Therefore, the world of 20 years from now already exists, in embryo, in today's advanced research establishments.

For the year 2000 however, we can foresee some really far-out developments.

The virtual elimination of bacterial and viral diseases.

The correction of hereditary defects through the modification of genetic chemistry.

The stepping-up of our food supply through large-scale ocean-farming and the fabrication of synthetic proteins.

Control of the weather, at least on a regional scale.

In space, the landing of men on Mars and the establishment of a permanent unmanned research station on that planet.

The creation, in the laboratory, of primitive forms of artificial life.

This can indeed be an age of miracles. It will be your age.

Your federal government is committed to working with you to help bring about a better tomorrow. The amount of the budget which is devoted to support of research and development has been the fastest growing item in the federal budget.

I have heard it suggested that this is a result not of public officials learning about science, but of scientists learning about politics. In fact, I think it has been a bit of both: The nation and its store of knowledge have been the beneficiaries of this mutual learning process.

The percentage of funds for research and development has gone up from about 25 per cent of the monies to support science in 1957 to about 40 per cent in 1965.

Since you have a mathematical background, you know that these percentages tell you nothing about the absolute dollar magnitude.

So I feel I must add that the 1957 figure is 25 percent of 3 billion dollars and the 1965 figure is 40 per cent of 15 billion dollars.

The funds available for scientific research have increased in the last 8 years by a factor of 8.

Of course, the costs of doing scientific research increase very quickly as scientists ask more sophisticated questions of nature, and expect answers which are much more precise. Probably the most dramatic example of this is the decision to build an atom smasher with the power of 200 Bevatron (billion electron volts) at a cost of approximately 300 million dollars.

Since this item and many others are beyond the financial limits of any of our universities, and since the benefits are for everyone, it is only right and proper for the federal government to play its role and it will continue to do so.

Research costs more. There has also been a change in the strategy of research.

I return, for my example, to our space program.

I have logged over a quarter of a million miles in looking into various aspects of our space program.

The discovery of the structure of space has required new theories, new instruments, new materials and techniques. We have begun to experiment on a vast scale and we are only now at the threshold. The impetus which the space program has given us has led to advances in education, medicine, electronics, and many other fields.

And this has increasingly been done—as I pointed out before—through the creative development of many programs, involving many disciplines and many scientists, carried out not only by government but by all sectors of our society.

The value of our coordinated assault on the unknown has given us the impetus to extend our knowledge in other places. Luckily, for me, I am again involved.

I have recently been appointed chairman of a newly created National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development which will look at the state of our knowledge of the oceans to see what kind of national program is needed to extend and utilize our knowledge of this inner space. We are now in the position where current exploration and theory has revealed how little we know and has suggested the vast benefits which may be possible.

The oceans cover 70 per cent of the earth's surface and hold untold wealth. Maybe it is time we took the plunge.

I have only touched today on some of the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead.

But I will go no further. I would like to close by having a brief personal word with you.

I have heard it said that science is a cold and unemotional career.

We know better.

The world of science is the world of man's greatest adventure. It is an adventure far beyond that begun by Columbus or by Alexander the Great or by Cortez.

It is an adventure into the unknown. It is the search into the deep secrets which may yield answers far beyond man's hope. It is the place for the man or woman who will devote himself, through long hours of labor and difficulty, to mankind's cause. It is the place where years of dedication and effort may yield little. Yet it is the place where discovery and accomplishment can bring a sense of reward and exhilaration that comes to few people.

I applaud your choice of career. It is a career of excitement. I wish you well in it.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE COMMISSIONING OF THE NEW RESEARCH SHIP, THE "OCEANOGRAPHER," NAVY YARD, PIER 2, JULY 13, 1966

Secretary and Mrs. Connor, Reverend Harris, Captain Wardwell, my beloved friend Senator MAGNUSON, Governor Burns of Hawaii, Distinguished Members of Congress, Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We meet here today at the beginning of a new age of exploration.

To some, this might mean our adventures in outer space. But I am speaking of exploring an unknown world at our doorstep. It is really our last frontier here on earth. I am speaking of mountain chains that are yet to be discovered, of natural resources that are yet to be tapped, of a vast wilderness that is yet to be chartered.

This is the sea around us.

While our knowledge of the sea is quite primitive, we do know something of its great potential for the betterment of the human race and all mankind.

We know that we can, for instance, greatly improve our weather predictions. We can save thousands of lives and millions of dollars in property each year. We just must start learning more about the sea.

We know that the sea holds a great promise of transforming arid regions of the earth into new, rich and productive farmlands.

We know that beneath the sea are countless minerals and fuels which can be found and exploited. We know—most important of all—that the sea holds the ultimate answer to food for the exploding population in the world. Nearly four-fifths of all life on earth actually exists in salt water.

Using science and technology, we must develop improved ways of taking food from the ocean.

But catching fish is just not enough. It has been said that throughout history we have been simple hunters of the sea. Men must now learn how to farm the sea.

Our scientists are developing a process for turning whole fish into a tasteless but highly nutritious protein concentrate which can be used as a supplement to our daily diet.

In addition, the United States Senate has recently passed a bill for the construction of several pilot plants to begin the commercial development of this fish protein food. The daily output of one of these plants would provide enough high protein supplement for well over half a million people each day.

It is toward a goal of understanding all aspects of the sea that we have commissioned the *Oceanographer* today.

Oceanographer is one of the Coast and Geodetic Survey's 14 research ships which will begin to help us explore the environment around us. Her sister ship, *Discoverer*, is under construction and also will be commissioned shortly.

In the past decade, our support of marine science and technology has grown from some $21 million to more than $320 million.

The Federal research fleet today totals 115 vessels.

Our progress has been the handiwork, of course, of many men. These men are in and out of Government. But the Nation owes a very particular debt to those particular members of the Congress, men such as our distinguished Senator MAGNUSON of Washington, who is here today and whose efforts have accomplished so much for oceanography over the last decade.

I want to pay tribute to the Secretary, the Under Secretary, the Assistant Secretaries, all the employees of the Department of Commerce and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and other Government officials.

But I also want to say that today we must redouble our efforts. In the months ahead, we shall establish our priorities, we shall then set our timetables—and we shall follow them, just as we have followed an orderly and relentless program for the exploration of space. And the distinguished Scientific Adviser to the President, Dr. Hornig, is going to keep seeing that we do this. The frontier of our deep challenges our spirit and we want to see that that challenge from the deep is fully met.

My Science Advisory Committee has recently completed a report on "The Effective Use of the Sea." Through Dr. Hornig I am releasing that report today. I should like to commend it to the attention of all Americans.

I commend it, in particular, to the 100 outstanding high school students who have joined us here today and who have come to the Capital from the States of this Union. I hope that there are among you some of the great oceanographers of tomorrow. You could not choose, in my judgment, a more important or a more challenging career.

I am referring this report from my Science Advisory Committee to the new National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering set up by statute under the leadership of Senator MAGNUSON. This Council will be headed by our distinguished Vice President; distinguished members of the Cabinet and others will serve on it.

This Council will survey all marine science activities to provide for this Nation a comprehensive program in this field. I will ask them to complete their initial recommendations by the time the new Congress convenes next January.

Truly great accomplishments in oceanography will require the cooperation of all the maritime nations of the world. Today I send our voice out from this platform calling for such cooperation, requesting it, and urging it.

To the Soviet Union—a major maritime power—I today extend our earnest wish that you may join with us in this great endeavor.

In accordance with these desires I am happy to announce that one of the first long voyages of *Oceanographer* will be a six-month global expedition in which the scientists from a number of our great nations will participate. It is our intention to invite Great Britain, West Germany, France, the U.S.S.R., India, Malaysia, Australia, New Zealand, Chile, and Peru to participate in the first round-the-world voyage of *Oceanographer*.

We greatly welcome this type of international participation. Under no circumstances, we believe, must we ever allow the prospects of rich harvest and mineral wealth create a new form of colonial competition among the maritime nations. We must be careful to avoid a race to grab and to hold the lands under the high seas. We must ensure that the deep seas and the ocean bottoms are, and remain, the legacy of all human beings.

The sea, in the words of Longfellow, "divides and yet unites mankind."

So to Capitain Wardwell and his distinguished officers and men of *Oceanographer*, we say today: Yours is a most worthwhile mission. May you bring back much for the benefit of all humanity.

We congratulate you on the commissioning of your marvelous new ship. We wish you the best of results, fair winds, and smooth sailing.

And now I look forward with a great deal of personal pleasure to the opportunity to view the ship and some of the developments at first hand.

Thank you very much.

Maynard Flag Day Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the American flag and all it represents is the best hope of the Nation and the world for freedom and peace. That is the message I conveyed during impressive Flag Day exercises at Maynard, Mass., in my district, in which I was privileged to participate as guest speaker.

I ask unanimous consent that part of my remarks at these exercises be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The material follows:

REMARKS IN PART OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN, FLAG DAY EXERCISES, MAYNARD, MASS, JUNE 5, 1966

Our flag with its striking colors has inspired millions and millions of Americans to uphold the cause of liberty and justice. It is an emblem of courage, loyalty, sacrifice and determination to preserve American ideals and principles and our free way of life, so vital to each and every one of us.

Old Glory is a symbol of encouragement and enlightenment, truly a beacon light of hope and inspiration for the down-trodden and the oppressed of all lands, as well as a powerful motivating force for the people of this country to strive for security, independence, progress and peace.

Our Flag exemplifies the spiritual beliefs and moral aspirations of a people dedicated, as we are, to the protection of individual rights, the sanctity of family life, social justice and humane betterment for our fellow citizens and human kind.

Today, as always, we rededicate ourselves to this flag, and this country, and this great, free government, this fabulous, free-enterprise system that has enabled us to become the greatest, most powerful, most prosperous nation in history.

As we renew our pledge of allegiance to this flag, let us lift up our hearts in prayerful gratitude to our Maker for the blessings he has conferred upon our nations, and upon us, and let us resolve to stand firmly, unfalteringly and bravely against tyranny and injustice, as Americans have always stood, for our freedoms, our homes, our shores and all the precious values that America means to us—for the rule of law, order and justice in the country and the world, and for enduring peace which will end bloody conflict, and restore amity, understanding and friendly relations in the world.

Hail to Old Glory—may it always wave over a free, secure, prosperous nation. And may it soon wave over a land and in a world united in peace and brotherhood.

The Open-Housing Provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 15, 1966

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an outstanding broadcasting station in my neighboring State of North Carolina, presented an excellent editorial concerning the so-called open-housing provisions of legislation now pending before the Senate. The thoughts expressed in this editorial so clearly reflect the principles involved in this type legislation, that I ask unanimous consent that the editorial broadcast on June 7, 1966, by WBT in Charlotte, N.C., be included in the Appendix of the Congressional Record.

ask unanimous consent that the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whose House Is Whose Castle?

One of the great problems in extending equal opportunity to all the citizens of America is the discrimination in housing that has created ghetto patterns in the cities of America. One of the most tragic errors and greatest threats to fundamental liberty that the citizens of America have ever faced is the provision of the new civil rights bill that tries to correct this situation by force of law.

The bill, on which Senator Sam Ervin of North Carolina has opened hearings, forbids anyone anywhere who is selling or renting property of any kind to discriminate on account of race, color, religion, or national origin. If an individual or the Attorney General's office cares to bring a charge, anyone owning or leasing property can be hauled into court at their own expense while the government foots the bill for the plaintiff, and will have to prove by some means that he was not discriminating on these grounds.

You might have turned the applicant down because he drinks too much or has more children than you want in your property, or keeps parakeets, or sings loudly in the bathtub, but he can claim it was because he was Negro, Indian, or Irish—Catholic, Protestant or Jew—German, Swedish, or Sudanese. The amount of consideration you would get in a Federal court in this day and age can be pretty well predicted.

The fifth and fourteenth amendments guarantee private property rights, but this is another case where the government lawyers can see only the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. When Senator Dirksen said, "If you can tell me what interstate commerce is involved in selling or renting a house fixed to the soil, or where there is Federal jurisdiction, I'll go out and eat the chimney off the house," Attorney General Katzenbach solemnly replied that the house materials, furniture, and other items must have moved across a state line at some time, so the whole house is a product of interstate commerce. That far-fetched reasoning was seconded by a Professor Philip Kurland of the University of Chicago, who said that "the time has come to regard the commerce clause as almost plenary in its application".

Well, if the interstate commerce clause supersedes all the other parts of the Constitution and can be used to nullify all limitations on the Federal Government and justify any act, constitutional or otherwise, we no longer have a Constitution or a Bill of Rights—we have only an interstate commerce clause.

In this debate, we are going to hear very often the old bromide, "property rights versus human rights." But these are inseparable. Property rights are a human right. If this bill passes, all the rights that go with ownership of property will be done away with in principle awaiting only the practice or application of an all-powerful government. And certainly a man's home will no longer be his castle.

You cannot extend freedom by taking it away.

A Case for Bridge and Hualapai Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, former Senator Goldwater is one of Arizona's great outdoorsmen. It would be difficult to find a person who has the awareness and love of his State's beauties which he has. Therefore, when Barry Goldwater states that the construction of the Bridge and Hualapai Dams on the Colorado River in no way will destroy the beauties of the Grand Canyon, you may be sure that it is so, and no one need fear otherwise. The following article by Senator Goldwater sets forth in clear fashion the facts of the case for the dams:

Because of the continuing controversy over the construction of dams in the Grand Canyon area, I would like once again to step aside from my political role and discuss what is essentially a technical matter.

There are very few men living who have explored, studied, and photographed the Grand Canyon as much as I have—or love it as much.

Others who claim to know and love the canyon, however, are now in arms against using its waters to bring new life to the arid central valleys of Arizona. The Sierra Club, an organization for which I have always had the highest regard, is leading the way. In my opinion they have fallen far short of their usual candor and honesty.

Two words taken from their widely-advertised opposition to the Grand Canyon project will explain why I make this charge.

They claim that dams on the Colorado River will "inundate" and "flood" the Grand Canyon. To a person not familiar with this beautiful canyon, which averages twelve miles in width, a mile in depth, and is 380 miles long, the vision conjured up by those two words must be horrible. No wonder such persons immediately write their Congressmen to block the project. Imagine the Canyon actually full of water! I agree, it is unthinkable. It also is a totally false impression.

Let's look at the truth. A key dam is Hualapai, or Bridge Canyon Dam as it was first called. It would be 600 feet high. It would rest at the bottom of the lower inner-gorge, which is 1,500 feet deep and is at the bottom of a main gorge which is 5,000 feet deep. The dam, therefore, would not even flood the inner gorge. It would, also, be in an area outside the boundaries of the National Park. Where its narrow lake would impinge on the Park it would be for a distance of only 13 miles and would have a maximum depth of only 90 feet.

As for marring the view of the Canyon, to my knowledge there is only one point, and this on the north rim, where a road now approaches the edge, from which this lake could be seen. It is also highly questionable as to whether such a relatively small lake would be an offensive view in such a vastness anyway.

In the future, of course, other roads or trails could be constructed to either the north or the south rim, but even then, a view of this lake would be very difficult to obtain because of the extreme depth in which it would rest in the bottom of the Canyon.

No matter how you see it, however, the Sierra Club's frightening vision of a flooded canyon is false and unworthy of their usually accurate stands in defense of sound conservation. In this case they are taking the role of a special pleader, arbitrarily trying to halt a measure which is, at its root, a perfectly sound conservation measure which will not imperil any "national treasure" or even a good view.

The water that the dam will make available is needed by the people who live in the deserts of Arizona. It would be provided under a plan that calls for repayment by the actual users of the water so that the Federal government would not be providing a special subsidy.

It is true that we have enough water right now. But we won't in a few years. This whole area could become another Ho-Ho-Kam, which is the name given to the five other civilizations which have lived in these valleys but had to leave because of lack of water.

And it seems to me that when one weighs the needs of the landscape against the needs of man, it should be man who wins out.

The Airline Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. PEARSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 15, 1966

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I join with my other colleagues today in expressing great concern over the continuation of the present airline strike which has crippled air traffic throughout the

United States. I cite the State of Kansas as another example of how many businesses are being unnecessarily affected by a strike which must be settled soon to protect the economy of the Nation.

Such firms as florists in the Kansas City area rely on air freight service to sustain their business. The president of the Olathe, Kans., Chamber of Commerce has advised me of serious economic handicaps in his city. Mr. B. C. Helzberg, president of the Helzberg Diamond Shop forwarded his telegram to my office explaining the economic ramifications on his business.

Sales efforts of such firms as Thermo Dynamics in Shawnee Mission are being crippled because salesmen are unable to make their calls. The Bio Laboratories in the same area has suffered a crippling blow due to the reduction in freight and personnel hauling requirements.

The President must move swiftly to avoid any furtherance of the damaging effects of this strike. I ask that telegrams from 25 separate Kansas establishments be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator JAMES B. PEARSON,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The airline strike has moved to its seventh day. It is seriously affecting the normal operation of our company which depends heavily on serving its customer emergency spare parts needs via air freight and dispatches service personnel to points all around the country via commercial airlines. Inability to provide parts and service means envelope manufacturers throughout the country are deprived of machine productivity and hence revenue. Even as small operation as ours is being seriously handicapped in its normal operation with much more serious consequences to our customers. As a Johnson County Kansas resident I urge that you intercede for rapid settlement of the airline strike.

JAMES W. LENK,
Vice President.

BALDWIN, KANS,
July 14, 1966.

Senator JAMES B. PEARSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As educational institution we are appealing to you to help settle the present airline strike. We fly out of Kansas City, Mo., on student recruiting trips. Our students and parents use the airlines to visit the colleges and Kansas. Your help will be greatly appreciated.

P.S. Enjoyed your commencement address on our campus June 6.

M. RAY TERRELL,
Director of Admissions, Baker University, Baldwin, Kans.

EMPORIA, KANS.,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. JAMES B. PEARSON,
Senator of Kansas,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

My administrative staff joins me in expressing grave concern over the current airplane strike and its effect on our nationwide economy and its great inconvenience to the traveling public this summer. Any personal attention and help you can give to this serious situation will be deeply appreciated by your many constituents. We have wondered if President Johnson is receiving the deluge of telegrams now being directed to his attention.

JOSEPH R. LAUGHLIN,
President, College of Emporia.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. JAMES B. PEARSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

6,000 airline employees in this area are out of work as a result of the mechanics strike. Million of dollars of payroll is lost to local economy. This has a damaging effect on the economy plus great inconvenience and loss of time to many of our citizens. I urge your influence in any way possible to bring the disastrous strike to an early end.

SMITH GRIEVES CO., *Kansas City, Mo.*

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator J. B. PEARSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectively request your utmost effort to promote agreement in strike of five major airlines permitting settlement satisfactory to union, management and our country. Each passing day multiplies hardships seriously affecting business and the national economy.

A. C. SWANSON,
President, Western Auto Supply Co.

LAWRENCE, KANS.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator JAMES E. PEARSON,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C:.

Believe time public and business get protection from arbitrary crippling strike. Airline strike interfering with our business operations. Please exert your influence to settle the strike.

RUSSELL A. MOSSER,
Centron Corp.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *July 14, 1966.*

Hon. JAMES B. PEARSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We plead with you to lend all possible assistance in settling the airline strike that is affecting the Nation. Our immediate territory is being hurt severely.

MAURICE D. S. JOHNSON,
Executive Vice President, First National Bank of Kansas City.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *July 14, 1966.*

Senator JAMES B. PEARSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your support in ending airline strike. It is important for the economy of Kansas City and the Nation that something be done quickly.

HARZFELD'S INC.,
SAUL D. KASS, *Treasurer.*

WICHITA, KANS., *July 14, 1966.*

JAMES B. PEARSON,
U.S. Senator, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Please bring to bear all possible force in your command to end the airlines strike.

ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES, INC.,
W. F. HENRY.

SHAWNEE MISSION, KANS.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator JAMES PEARSON,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Major airline strike is beginning to seriously effect our shipment and sales. Would appreciate any efforts you can exert to bring about a settlement.

GEORGE M. MCGREW,
Chairman of Board, Electro Dynamics Corp.

SHAWNEE MISSION, KANS.,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. JAMES B. PEARSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

International and domestic business already suffering because of airline strike. We ask your help in bringing pressure upon mediators to settle strike soon as possible.

JOE F. KNAPPENBERGER,
President, Haver-Lockart Laboratories.

KANSAS CITY, KANS.,
July 15, 1966.

Senator JAMES B. PEARSON,
Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We request your help in ending the airline strike. In our opinion strong Federal measures are in order to force the unions back to work examples the airlines have more than complied with the Presidential emergency board recommendations the airlines have consented to use the national mediation board the unions rejected this categorically.

Let's stop the useless harm to our economy.

ROBERT J. CLARK,
Vice President, Conroy Coffee Co.

OVERLAND PARK, KANS.,
July 15, 1966.

Hon. JAMES B. PEARSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Airline strike disastrous please take immediate steps for reinstatement for flight operations. Thanks.

Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE D. BURTON.

TOPEKA, KANS.,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. JAMES B. PEARSON
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request you use every facility of your office to bring about settlement of airline strike which is hurting economy of Kansas.

C. C. KILKER,
Executive Vice President, Kansas State Chamber of Commerce.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

JAMES PEARSON,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Airline strike effect on local economy is severe. We urge you to help effect Government action to halt strike immediately.

ALFRED LIGHTON,
President, Woolf Bros.

WICHITA, KANS.,
July 15, 1966.

Hon. JAMES B. PEARSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The operation of our business is seriously complicated and may soon be curtailed by the current airline strike. We understand the companies have agreed to the President's committee guidelines but that the unions want to ignore them. Suggest congressional intervention to determine whether or not this is good faith bargaining under the Taft-Hartley Act.

VULCAN MATERIALS CO.,
CHEMICALS DIVISION.

KANSAS CITY, KANS.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator JIM PEARSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Air strike crippling to our industry in both freight and personnel hauling requirements. Your cooperation in helping to bring this to a conclusion is sorely needed. My friend, Albert Kiesow, sends his regards. I hope to meet you personally on your next visit home.

DUKE SWEEN,
President, BIO Laboratories, Inc.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator JAMES B. PEARSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The air strike is beginning to hurt the country. Can't some way be found to make the unions work while difference are being arbitrated.

LEWIS KITCHEN.

JULY 14, 1966.

Hon. JAMES B. PEARSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The pending airline strike is seriously affecting the economy of the Kansas City region and your efforts to bring about rapid settlement will be greatly appreciated by citizens and businesses of this area.

Sincerely,

PLEASANT V. MILLER, Jr.,
President, Commerce Trust Co.

SHAWNEE MISSION, KANS.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator JAMES PEARSON,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We will appreciate any help you can contribute toward settlement of the major airline strike. Our traveling sales efforts and air shipments are being seriously crippled.

THERMO DYNAMICS CORP.,
MAX W. BURRO, *President.*

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator JAMES PEARSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our firm depends on air freight service into Kansas City for 85 percent of our shipping. Please do what you can to help in this air strike.

EARL G. LACE,
Wholesale Florist.

OLATHE, KANS.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator JAMES PEARSON,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge immediate steps to resolve airlines strike before harmful effect on national economy worsens.

JAMES R. HARRIS,
President, Olathe, Kans., Chamber of Commerce.

OVERLAND PARK, KANS.,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. JAMES B. PEARSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to take immediate steps to settle airline strike in order to protect economy of our Nation and State you represent.

P. J. RUBURN.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator JAMES B. PEARSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The economic ramifications of the current airline strike are becoming more serious for our area every day it continues. We appeal that you do all possible to help end it promptly.

B. C. HELZBERG, Jr.,
President, Helzberg's Diamond Shops.

TOPEKA, KANS.,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. JAMES B. PEARSON,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please put forth every effort in your power to arrive at immediate strike settlement of airline. This strike is hurting the economy at home and the Nation as well. Many millions of dollars have been lost by delay. We depend greatly on airlines for our mode of travel.

R. F. KOLTERMAN,
President, American Home Life Insurance Co.

India's Import Initiative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, the ill-starred, ill-fed democracy of India represents the hope of mid-20th century Asia. Her desire for national political unity on a democratic basis is a desire shared by all of us in the West who benefit from democratic institutions and ideals everyday.

Yet, those who look with high expectation to India's future know at a glance that her population, weather, agricultural production, and industrial capacity millitate against the stability that democratic institutions demand in order to flourish. The economic plight of India must be alleviated and finally solved if this vast subcontinent is to offer a model to other Asian countries now emerging into the harsh realities of the 20th century.

With these thoughts in mind, I was heartened to read recent newspaper accounts that Prime Minister Ghandi's government had announced a policy which bodes well for the increased development and productivity of India's delicately balanced economy. The announcement outlined a policy of liberalization of restrictions on imports affecting foreign raw materials and spare parts.

It was a bold move and courageous step forward along the path of economic viability. In breaking out of the cage of a controlled and protective economy, India has shown herself willing to meet assisting countries and world organizations halfway. She has recognized the great harm that comes of a domestic industry running at only half its capacity. And it became painfully clear that foreign sources of assistance were increasingly reluctant to extend aid to an economy whose prospects for self-sustained growth were becoming ever dimmer.

Mr. Speaker, it is for this reason that the new expansionary policy should receive our praise and support. It will restore confidence in the countries providing aid, as well as increase the chances that aid money will be better invested. As Americans, steeped in the tradition of self-help and free competition, we owe India our vote of confidence and a renewed promise of willing financial support. In so doing we reaffirm our belief in the developing nations who care enough to help themselves.

Following is an editorial from the Washington Post and two articles from the Post and New York Times which report on the new Indian policy.

[From the Washington Post, June 23, 1966]

PRAISE FOR INDIA

The liberalization of India's import policies which have hitherto limited the availability of many commodities needed by Indian industry ought to receive general praise. This is not just because the action has been urged and recommended by the United States, the World Bank and others involved in aiding India. It is primarily because it is a policy that, by every available evidence, is necessary to get the economy of India moving. And the very first essential of progress in India is a rate of economic growth that will move the economic system forward and achieve a high rate of self-sustained industrial and agricultural development.

The Congress Party has kept the Indian economy in wraps. It has had an exaggerated confidence in economic controls. The Prime Minister has had the courage to take the initiative and depart from this policy.

Much as the United States may and will applaud this courageous act, India needs more than praise and applause. We have a large stake in helping the Indian government prove this expansionary policy the right one. It will be a catastrophe indeed if the freer economy does not produce progress in India. It must be made to work and, if it is to work, foreign help for industrial and agricultural development must be forthcoming from the United States and from the whole consortium involved in financing India.

India has taken several bold steps—devaluation, lower import barriers, a shaking up of the public sector, a new impetus in agriculture. But it faces a crisis in the next six months in which the weather and foreign help that it does not control still may be decisive. We cannot control the monsoon which so cruelly disappointed India last year, but we can have a great influence on aid.

[From the Washington Post, June 22, 1966]

AID BOOSTED, INDIA EASES IMPORT BARS

(By Warren Unna)

NEW DELHI, June 21.—India decided today to liberalize her import policy on foreign raw materials and spare parts. The decision was made as the World Bank's "Aid India" consortium came up with a record amount of foreign currency to help ease the risk in the new liberalization.

The liberalization on imports is a radical step for a country that has long prided itself on a controlled and protective economy.

Raw materials and spare parts are badly needed by a domestic industry that has been running at half its capacity.

The World Bank consortium figure approaches $900 million in what is called "nonproject assistance." This is aid that is not tied to designated programs and thus is readily usable for whatever India's economic planners deem most necessary.

The total aid package, including the "project" or designated assistance for this current first year of India's fourth 5-year plan, is expected to reach $1.5 billion.

In the past the World Bank consortium had been able to raise only about $600 million in nonproject and about $1 billion in overall annual aid.

The United States, as in the past, is the biggest contributor.

The U.S. commitment is for about $450 million, $100 million for nonproject raw material and spare parts purchases promised earlier this year during the visit here of Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, $280 million in new nonproject aid and $70 million in project aid.

Two countries, West Germany and Japan, had been holding up the World Bank consortium announcement—and the parallel Indian liberalization announcement. The Germans, whose thinking is governed by hard headed business terms rather than considerations of international politics, are expected to come up with about $76 million in nonproject aid after Indian Finance Minister Sachindra Chaudhuri makes a personal visit to Bonn later this week. The Japanese are now expected to come up with $53 million.

With the final tally in from Germany, Japan, the United States, as well as the other consortium members (Britain, France, Canada, the Netherlands, Italy, Belguim, the Bank itself and its International Development Association) it is hoped that the figure will be nearer $900 million than the present $800 million.

The difference will have an effect on how much and how readily India feels it can liberalize its imports. Originally, after an understanding reached between World Bank President George Woods and Indian Minister of Planning Asoka Mehta in Washington in April, India hoped to make an across the board import liberalization on all spare parts and raw material components in return for getting $900 million in nonproject aid.

With something less than that, India feels its liberalization must come more gradually. This means allowing in such noncompetitive raw materials as copper and zinc now and assuring the country's 59 priority industries that they will be granted import licenses for other goods when they apply.

Some economists see a danger in this. They fear that India's big industrialists will be delighted with the assurance of importing the essential parts but will pressure the government against any later liberalization on importing the foreign finished goods that may give them a run for their money.

And yet this liberalization also is considered vital to India's economy. If the country is ever to be prodded into expanding the use of its existing capacity, as well as into increasing the industrial capacity itself, foreign competition is considered the necessary prodder.

[From the New York Times, June 22, 1966]

India Liberalizes Limits on Imports: Sweeping Move Is Desgined To Spur Industrial Growth

(By J. Anthony Lukas)

New Delhi, June 21.—The Indian Government announced tonight a sweeping liberalization of restrictions on imports. The purpose is to provide more raw materials and spare parts for the country's lagging industrial machine.

The move follows indications from the 10-nation Aid India Consortium that it would provide increased commodity assistance to finance these imports.

Although the Government announced its intention to liberalize imports two weeks ago, the timing of the move surprised observers here. It had not been expected until after the consortium announced a predicted $900-million aid pledge.

The consortium pledge has been delayed—in part because of hesitation by West Germany and Japan over their contributions—but the Indian Government decided to go ahead with the liberalization now.

INDIANS EXPRESS CONFIDENCE

Indian officials said tonight they were not taking much of a chance. They said India already had private pledges from most of the consortium countries. They expressed confidence that the full $900-million aid or a sum close to it, would be announced shortly.

Finance Minister Sachindra Chaudhuri left on a trip to Europe during which he is to discuss aid prospects with West Germany, the country providing the most difficulty now, as well as with Britain, the Netherlands, France and Italy.

However, officials here also said that the liberalization could not have waited. They said that it was a companion move to the devaluation of the rupee announced June 5 and that, without it, devaluation would have been meaningless.

The Government is counting on the increased supplies of raw materials and spare parts to bring industrial production up to full capacity, reduce prices raised by devaluation and permit increased exports. Every day the liberalization was delayed meant delay in getting this process started.

STEPS URGED BY CREDITORS

Liberalization and devaluation are among the steps that had been urged by the United States and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in order to get the Indian economy moving. They had become the conditions for increased Western assistance for India's fourth five-year plan.

Tonight's move, which was described by the Government as a first step, affected primarily 59 so-called "priority" industries.

These are industries that either contribute to exports, help provide substitutes for goods now imported or produce for essential domestic consumption.

Small companies operating in these 59 industries will be able to obtain licenses virtually automatically. They will be authorized to handle imports up to three times the rupee value of the licenses they were granted in 1964–65.

Chairman of Senate Public Works Committee Keynotes Leadership Seminar Which Initiates Citizen Workshops on Clean Water for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 15, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Izaak Walton League of America and 13 cooperating organizations have scheduled—for this summer and early fall—a series of citizen workshops on clean water for America. These workshops are designed to inform and educate the public in the need for active participation in the development of water quality standards, as called for by the Federal Water Quality Act of 1965. This educational project in all regions of the country is being financed in part through a grant to the Izaak Walton League from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to have participated as keynote speaker in the initial nationwide planning and study seminar which was held at the University of Maryland's Center of Adult Education on June 17 to 19. Eighty officials representing the Federal Government, State agencies, conservation and wildlife organizations, business and labor groups attended this initial seminar which will contribute significantly to the success and effectiveness of the subsequent area workshops. My home State was represented by H. G. Woodrum, president of the Izaak Walton League in West Virginia.

The conferees pursued extensive discussions of the various aspects of State and Federal roles in water quality control, including proper financing of State agencies, adequate statutes, financial assistance for construction of abatement facilities, education, enforcement, and research. In this initial conference, special emphasis was placed on the Water Quality Act of 1965, under which States may establish water quality standards on interstate waters within their boundaries.

The 3-day leadership seminar at College Park was chaired by the able president of the Conservation Foundation, Russell E. Train, who has established a distinguished record of public service in conservation affairs. The distinguished national president of the Izaak Walton League, Reynolds T. Harnsberger, extended the official welcome to the conferees and the league's conservation director, J. W. Penfold, explained the objectives of the citizen workshops. Among the guest speakers was James M. Quigley, Commissioner of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. Commissioner Quigley discussed the "Federal Government and Clean Water." The Izaak Walton League and the cooperating organizations obviously visualize the 1965 act as offering significant opportunity for citizens to constructively participate with Federal and State officials in the critical effort to achieve clean water. The league considers it important that the leadership of the various workshops be in a position to advise citizen participants on pollution abatement programs and on how to participate in State hearings.

Those who were present at the initial planning and study seminar returned to their respective home areas to form committees to sponsor regional workshops. These workshops—consisting of discussions and planning sessions—will be attended by representatives of service clubs, conservation organizations, and other local and area persons who may be concerned with future water quality hearings in their regions. The importance of participating in public hearings and methods of effective presentation will be the theme of the regional citizen workshops on clean water for America.

For this commendable endeavor in the development of citizen education and awareness of the pressing national problem of water quality, I congratulate the Izaak Walton League of America and the cooperating organizations: Conservation Foundation, American Fisheries Society, Garden Club of America, General Federation of Women's Clubs, League of Women Voters Education Fund, National Association of Counties, National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, National Audubon Society, National Council of State Garden Clubs, National Wildlife Federation, Sport Fishing Institute, Wildlife Society, and Wildlife Management Institute.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the program of the planning seminar for citizen workshops on clean water for America, the welcome by Mr. Reynolds T. Harnsberger, the remarks by Mr. J. W. Penfold, and the text of my address.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Citizen Workshops on Clean Water for America—Leadership Seminar—June 17–19, 1966—Center of Adult Education, University of Maryland, College Park, Md., Friday, June 17

Morning Session—Chairman: Russell E. Train, President, The Conservation Foundation.

Welcome—Reynolds T. Harnsberger, National President, The Izaak Walton League of America.

Why the Workshops—J. W. Penfold, Conservation Director, The Izaak Walton League of America.

Address—Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Chairman, Committee on Public Works, United States Senate.

The Federal Government and Clean Water—Hon. James M. Quigley, Commissioner, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

State Government and Clean Water—James Coulter, Chief, Bureau of Environmental Hygiene, Maryland State Health Department.

Afternoon Session—Chairman: Thomas L. Kimball, Executive Director, National Wildlife Federation.

WHAT QUALITY WATER IS NEEDED FOR

Fish and Wildlife—Richard H. Stroud, Executive Vice-President, Sport Fishing Institute.

Public Health and Recreation: C. L. Wilbar, Jr., Chairman, Pennsylvania Sanitary Water Board.

Industry: David E. Simon II, Cyrus Wm. Rice & Company.

Agriculture: Clarence S. Britt, Assistant to Branch Chief, Soil & Water Conservation Research Division, USDA.

Steering Committee Meeting on Regional Workshop Planning.

SATURDAY, JUNE 18

Chairman: Mrs. Haskell Rosenblum, League of Women Voters of the U.S.

Water Quality Standards and Enforcement: Murray Stein, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

Working With Industry on State Water Quality Standards and Clean Water Programs: Harold Jacobs, E. I. DuPont Co.

Coffee and Doughnuts in Exhibit Hall.

Organizing Responsible Statewide Citizen Cooperation for Clean Water: Charles H. Callison, Assistant to the President, National Audubon Society.

Techniques of Effective Citizen Participation in the Hearings Process: Mrs. C. F. S. Sharpe, Program, Secretary Water Resources, League of Women Voters of the U.S.

WORKSHOPS CONVENE, 1:30

Workshop No. 1: Helping Local Government to Participate Effectively in Developing State Water Quality Programs. Chairman: Rodney Kendig, Field Service Director, National Association of Counties. Co-Chairman: John R. Sheaffer, Resources Planning Officer, Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission.

Workshops No. 2: Making the Most of State Hearings—the Procedural Process and Follow-up. Chairman: Sydney Howe, The Conservation Foundation. Co-Chairman: Philip Barske, Northeast Field Representative, Wildlife Management Institute.

Workshop No. 3: Defining the Water Quality You Want—Expressing Clean Water Objectives in Terms of Uses, with Awareness of Costs, etc. Chairman: Gerard A. Rohlich, Director, University of Wisconsin Water Resources Center. Co-Chairman: Mrs. Frank O. Sandstrom, Northeastern Zone Representative The Garden Club of Ameirca.

Workshop No. 4: The Citizen's Water Quality Survey—How to Get and Present Useful Information. Chairman: Joseph Chantigney, General Vice-Chairman Cook County, Ill., Clean Streams Committee. Co-Chairman: Francis T. Christy, Jr., Vice-President (Conservation) Audubon Naturalist Society of the Central Atlantic States.

Workshop No. 5: Working Together—Organizing Effective Sustained Cooperation Among Citizen Groups, Local and Statewide. Chairman: Mrs. Donald E. Clusen, Chairman, Water Resources Committee, League of Women Voters of the U.S. Co-Chairman: William B. Morse, Northwest Field Representative, Wildlife Management Institute.

SUNDAY, JUNE 19

Chairman: Mrs. Arthur E. Whittemore, League of Women Voters Education Fund.

Workshop Reports by Workshop Chairmen.

Report on Plan for Regional Workshops.

Summary: Frank Gregg, Vice-President, The Conservation Foundation.

Closing Remarks: J. W. Penfold, IWLA.

Welcome

(Reynolds T. Harnsberger, national president, the Izaak Walton League of America)

Judge Train, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a great privilege for me to open the first Citizen Workshop for Clean Water. I welcome you, individually as respected conservation leaders, and also as representatives of respected citizen organizations who—with us in the Izaak Walton League—are determined to improve the environment within which all Americans must live.

In a real sense, a welcome from me might be thought superfluous, because this workshop and seminar is yours as well as ours. Your interest and cooperation has helped make it possible—its values will assuredly be realized only as your talents, expertise, imagination and foresight are utilized during workshop sessions.

We in the Izaak Walton League of America have had a long history of interest, concern and action in the clean water movement. It can be said truthfully that a major reason for establishment of the League nearly 45 years ago was a growing disgust at the accelerating rate at which prime fishing waters were being lost to municipal, industrial and watershed pollution.

In 1927–1928, the League undertook at the request of President Coolidge's Outdoor Recreation Committee a nation-wide survey of water pollution. Handled through our State Divisions, local chapter and cooperating groups and individuals the survey was hardly a complete one, but it was the *first* national effort to appraise the water pollution problem nationally. What it found was shocking. And a shocked public very slowly began to take action. You have all been a part of that progress.

A great deal has happened since; a great deal of progress has been made, but the progress has not been fast enough and Congress itself in 1956—thirty years later—decided this was true and with enactment of PL–660 began to mobilize the resources of the Federal Government to supplement, compliment and stimulate State programs and community action.

Congress acted again in 1961 to strengthen the Federal role. And last year in passing the Water Quality Act launched an intensified program and announced an unequivocal national policy that we are in business to enhance the Nation's water resources, that we are in business to get water clean.

The States still retain their prerogative and priority of position to Act. This is as it should be, but—if they can not or will not act—the public is through with temporizing, and the Federal Government will act.

I believe all of us here are unanimous in hoping that the States will act. The purpose of this workshop and those to follow is basically to help mobilize responsible citizens to help their individual States do the best possible job for themselves.

This is a worthy and most laudable objective. You are accepting the challenge of good citizenship in a most meaningful sense. We welcome you. We applaud you. We wish you God speed in your endeavor.

Why the Workshops

(J. W. Penfold, conservation director, the Izaak Walton League of America)

In the Water Quality Act of 1965, Congress threw a direct challenge to each of the 50 States "to put up or shut up." It calls on them to declare their intentions and to follow up with positive actions to clean up pollution of interstate waters within their boundaries, or to expect the Federal Government to act for them in the public interest. The almost unanimous vote for the measure in Congress makes it clear that positive action is what the public wants. The public is tired of temporizing with filthy, unusable water.

The Act provides for the establishment of "water quality standards" on interstate waters. It provides a period, ending June 30, 1967, during which each State has the opportunity to develop such standards and a program for their implementation and enforcement. If standards and programs proposed by a State are found satisfactory by the Secretary, he will declare them to be the Federal standards. If he does not find them satisfactory, or if a State does not act at all, the Secretary is directed by the Act to institute procedures whereby standards shall be established. In every sense this is a challenge to all the States to "get cracking."

The Act calls for each State to develop its water quality standards program "following public hearings." Congress thus emphasized that the general public has a stake, a right and a responsibility in establishing water quality standards. Thoughtful citizens should insist that full public hearings be held in their States. It is equally their obligation to participate responsibly and effectively in such hearings.

The hearings will provide opportunity for citizens to state their right to clean water. As the President said "no one has the right to use America's rivers . . . which belong to all the people, as a sewer." But reiteration of this truism is not enough. Citizens must be prepared to answer arguments against high standards.

Citizens must be prepared to state clearly the uses which the public wishes to make of public waters.

Essentially, determining the beneficial uses which each lake and stream in each State must serve is the basis of the water quality standards program. If the public decides that a stream should serve no purpose other than as a sewer, that will be a standard, and an unconscionable one. The Nations can't afford to waste water that way. If the public decides that it shall be kept clean enough to support trout (or other game fish) and to permit water-skiing and swimming, it will likely be clean enough for use as water supply and for industry and agriculture as well . . . a high standard and a desirable one.

To maintain such a standard, or to accept a lower one is a political decision which the people themselves must make, or in default, it will be made for them.

Briefly, this is what the whole water quality standard program is really about—the public deciding what standards of excellence, or of filth, shall be maintained in its public waters to fulfill, or to limit, the beneficial uses to which the public wants to put their lakes and streams.

Essentially the purpose of this workshop program, which we are getting underway this morning, is to broaden our own understanding of the problem and the opportunities available to citizens to help solve it and to broaden the base of understanding among citizen groups generally . . . to the end that citizens will more nearly fulfill their role in the nation-wide effort to achieve clean water.

It is not enough that we declare ourselves for clean water. We must be prepared to accept the more difficult tasks—to secure legislation, to pass bond issues, to accept increased taxes, to pay higher commodity costs and to stand up and be counted when the going is rough.

Citizens will do this and do it well, but they must have the confidence which comes with understanding. Our work is to develop such understanding ourselves and to communicate it effectively to as large a segment of the public as we can.

During the next two days we shall be discussing ways and means for achieving these objectives and designing the plan whereby each of us and the citizen organizations we represent may make the maximum contribution toward this vital public need . . . clean water for America.

Keynote Address by Senator Jennings Randolph, Chairman, Senate Committee on Public Works, at Leadership Seminar Initiating Nationwide Citizen Workshop on Clean Water for America

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the Izaak Walton League for this manifestation of obligation as members of the American community.

The workshop, which begins today and is directed toward development of public interest in the establishment of water quality standards, is indeed a laudatory action.

When the Water Quality Act of 1965 was passed, the law provided that all affected segments of our national community should have an opportunity to participate in the establishment of water quality standards. There is no doubt in my mind, and I am sure there is no doubt in yours, that the industrial and governmental sectors of the economy will be well represented at any conference on standards.

The extent of citizen participation, however, would be clearly questionable were it not for the educational effort upon which you are embarking today. You are the consumers of water. You use it in every aspect of your daily life. Without it, you cannot function. Any problem associated with water becomes, uniquely, a human problem. Any decisions relative to the use or misuse of water, therefore, should be subject to the scrutiny of the people.

Last week in committee hearings on air pollution, as the new chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, I made a brief statement of my intentions regarding air and water pollution. As you are aware, that subcommittee is chaired by the very able Senator from Maine, Edmund S. Muskie. I told Senator Muskie, and those present, that I intended to give my every support to an aggressive attack on the problems of air and water pollution. I stated that we are going to go into these problems in a depth and scope never before attempted or achieved.

For your information, I would like to expand on that commitment. The late Senator Pat McNamara, when chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, established the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution and instructed that subcommittee to do whatever was necessary to protect the public health and welfare from the hazards society faces due to continued misuse of our vital air and water resource supplies.

That subcommittee, of which I am pleased to have been a member, has firmly set milestones on the path toward a solution of these problems. But the road is long, the job is tremendous, and time is not working in our favor. I therefore remind you—who will be working throughout the nation to achieve effective water quality standards—Senator McNamara said "Let us begin." I say, "Let us continue."

There is much that needs to be done. There are hurdles which must be passed over. The efforts that we make now are essential if we are to leave our future generations more secure in health and resources.

Water pollution control, adequate standards of water quality, effective enforcement, better and more economically feasible methods of treatment or, in sum, *clean rivers*—this is our goal. It is well that we understood both the problems and the costs associated with achieving that goal.

Before any acceptable program of water quality standards can be implemented, much of the eixsting pollution must be eliminated and all of it must be controlled. This in itself is a tremendous task, exemplified by the size of the pollution problem. I think we should look at the magnitude of the situation with which we are dealing.

The size of the pollution problem may be illustrated in a number of ways. One yardstick is available in terms of the population equivalent of wastes entering our watercourses. In 1900, these wastes equaled the raw, untreated sewage of a population of approximately 24 million. In 1960, this population equivalent had tripled to more than 75 million people. By 1980, if we do not markedly accelerate our efforts and results, we will be inflicting on our water resource the population equivalent of untreated sewage from 114 million people. This takes into account only municipal wastes.

Perhaps a better method of evaluation is the relation between total available supply of fresh water and how much of this supply is withdrawn and returned as waste-carrying water.

Our national available water supply is about 1,100 billion gallons a day. Currently, we withdraw about 355 billion gallons a day and return more than 190 billion gallons a day of waste-waters. By the year 2000 we will be withdrawing 990 billion gallons daily and returning 732 billion gallons of waste-carrying water. And, these are national averages. Many sections of the country can expect to overdraw their water supplies at a much earlier date.

Domestic sewage and other wastes that impose an oxygen-demand on the receiving waters have a serious impact on the aquatic life of our streams. By 1980, if waste treatment efficiency is not substantially improved, our treated effluents will impose an oxygen-demand great enough to consume the entire oxygen content of a volume of water equal to the dry weather flow of all the 22 river basins of the United States. This would be devastating.

Measured in immediate terms, we have only to admit the evidence of our senses of sight and smell to perceive the extent to which pollution has degraded our rivers, lakes, and streams.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 did not in any effective manner deal with the cost associated with a problem of this size.

Our investment in municipal waste treatment facilities is presently about $40 billion. It is conservatively estimated that an additional $20 billion of municipal waste treatment works construction is necessary to effectively control this important source of pollution. Combined sewer systems are another major source. Physical separation of these combined systems, which will ultimately be essential, will cost from $20 to $30 billion unless a more feasible and economical answer is found. Industrial treatment cost is generally estimated to be at least equivalent to that of the municipalities, about $20 billion, though this figure is purely conjectural.

All together, at least $70 billion, and perhaps $100 billion, is the price tag on dealing with the pollution problem if we are to preserve, maintain, and improve water quality to meet all of our legitimate needs and demands.

While the costs of pollution my present two alternatives, there is but one realistic choice. The nation's efforts *must* be geared to the preservation, maintenance and improvement of the quality of our available supplies. Time is not on the side of clean water. The problem is not one that will solve itself or even diminish by itself. Anticipated demands for clean useable water can only be met if pollution is swiftly checked and reversed. Each additional period of indecision results in increasing the necessary costs.

This year we are attempting to provide a more realistic Federal share of the cost of pollution control. As a result of hearings held throughout the nation last year, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Public Works Committee wrote legislation which was introduced by Senator Muskie and cosponsored by myself and 46 other members of the Senate. This legislation is designed to increase the federal commitment by removal of existing limitations on the federal share of a project's cost and providing, a minimum 30 per cent participation, regardless of the total cost involved. We determined that a full 30 per cent federal share would require at least $6 billion. We further determined that if minimum water quality needs are to be achieved, every effort should be made to deal with the problem within the next six years.

There is no question but that the problem requires earlier solution. However, it is equally obvious that it is not feasible to attempt to seek that earlier solution. The committee recognizes the problem of moving an effective program too rapidly.

The legislation sponsored by the subcommittee goes beyond broadening Federal participation, and increasing the total authorization. It was the opinion of most members of the subcommittee at the time the bill was drafted, that the states should be encouraged to participate on a much larger scale in the cost of pollution control. The subcommittee decided that an appropriate and acceptable method would be a Federal economic incentive. As introduced, the subcommittee's bill provides that when the states agree to match the Federal 30 per cent, and additional 10 per cent of the facilities cost will be provided by the Federal government.

There are other urgent needs which must be met. The subcommittee bill provides 25 million dollars annually for five years for a program of research in the area of advanced waste treatment and combined municipal and industrial treatment. It is particularly important that this research be done and that answers be found as quickly as possible.

Finally, the need for some kind of assistance to industry is highly apparent. Suggested alternatives include tax incentives and direct federal grants. The Congress cannot ignore this problem. Industrial effluent must be treated and in some instances has a higher priority than does municipal waste treatment. Some persons argue that industry should bear this burden alone. Unfortunately, and all too often, the cost of installation of adequate pollution control facilities would bankrupt an industry.

If a tax incentive approach seems warranted, Federal legislation would be handled by committees other than those presently concerned with pollution legislation. If a grant-in-aid approach is indicated, then my committee and its House counterpart would receive the legislation.

This matter needs, and will receive, intensive study. We are working closely with industry to decide the proper course to follow, and we shall find an answer.

In summary, I have discussed that which we are considering and will consider. But I would add that without a financially effective Federal grant program, the water quality standards which are achieved in the conference that many of you will attend, will be meaningless. Unless a method of treatment is developed for many of those wastes which do not lend themselves to the existing technology, water quality standards will suffer.

And even more importantly, unless the public is keenly aware and vitally interested in this process of standards setting, the public interest may not be protected.

But, I don't want to leave you on this negative note. The job is immense; the task is difficult; but with the research which is moving ahead today, and with the funds which will be made available, the job can be done. As chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, I can assure you that efforts you make in the various regions of this nation to establish effective water quality standards will be worthwhile. The Congress did not pass the Water Quality Act of 1965 as a gesture. It will be implemented as rapidly as is possible and this generation will leave clean rivers to the generations yet to come.

Prime Minister Pearson Proposes New Atlantic Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, recently in the hometown of Abraham Lincoln, New Salem, Ill., peace awards were presented to three great contemporary statesmen: Prime Minister Lester Pearson of Canada, former Secretary of State, Christian Herter, and the late Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson.

On receiving this award, Prime Minister Pearson presented a memorable speech outlining what America and other NATO nations must now do to revitalize an alliance which appears to be in disarray.

His comments are especially pertinent as Congress considers a number of Senate and House resolutions to establish delegations to attend a future convention of Atlantic nations. A report of Prime Minister Pearson's speech from the New York Times of June 12, 1966, follows:

NATO SUBSTITUTE URGED BY PEARSON—SAYS UNITED STATES SHOULD SHOW WAY TO REVITALIZED ALLIANCE

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., June 11.—Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson of Canada urged here tonight that the United States lead the way in establishing a new, revitalized Atlantic alliance to replace what he described as the outdated North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Whether or not the organization survive the crisis precipitated by the French military withdrawal, he said the Atlantic powers must move forward to "an international community with common political institutions."

"An alliance for defense only is an anachronism in the world of 1966," the Prime Minister declared.

In an address purpose for an Atlantic Union dinner in the Leland Hotel, Mr. Pearson obliquely criticized the United States for not acting sooner to alter "an Atlantic alliance of independent states, dominated by America."

"France, and not only France, feels that continental Europe is now strong enough to be given its rightful share in the control of the policies of the alliance" declared the Prime Minister, who won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1957.

Earlier in the day, Mr. Pearson received an Atlantic Union peace award at a ceremony in New Salem State Park, where the village of New Salem has been restored as it was when Abraham Lincoln ran a store there. The award was presented by Clarence Strett, president of Federal Union, Inc. This is a private organization that has worked for many years to bring European and North American states together in federation. Christian Herter, former Secretary of State, also was given an Atlantic Union peace award. The late Adlai E. Stevenson, who was chief United States delegate to the United Nations, also was honored with a peace award.

CITES DOUBT AND DISTRUST

Prime Minister Pearson said that the Atlantic powers had worked together enthusiastically in the trying days after World War II but had developed "impatience and doubt and some distrust" after the recovery of Europe. NATO, he suggested, had fallen victim to "inertia and vested interest in a new status quo."

He said Canada, since 1964, had tried without success "to find anyone . . . on either side of the Atlantic . . . prepared to specify what should be changed (in NATO)."

Change at last was occurring only because "abrupt and unilateral action by France thrust change upon us," he said.

Mr. Pearson disagreed with the nationalist motives of President de Gaulle in taking France out of the defense alliance. But he suggested it was "dangerous" to rail at General de Gaulle for demanding for France "a position in the Atlantic alliance equal to that of Great Britain and somewhat closer to that of the United States." Rather, Mr. Pearson said, the Atlantic power must find a way to enable France to participate "in the march to greater not less Atlantic unity."

The way, he suggested, would be to build toward Atlantic unity by first giving Europe "more control . . . of its direction and its character."

"I realize, he said, "that the united Europe would, in its political, economic and military decisions, be more independent of Washington than is the case now.

"But what is wrong with this?" he asked.

A realistic approach to Atlantic union, he said, would be to accept a united Europe, Britain, "not as an obstacle to, but as a stage on the way to Atlantic union.

"If we cannot at present achieve a pattern of Atlantic federalism," he said, "it may be necessary to acknowledge the realities of the situation and, as North Americans, work with Europeans in the hope that, in the longer sweep of history, both European and North America will come to realize that their respective affairs can best be harmonized in a wider union.

"If an intervening European stage is necessary, however, it must be taken not in continental isolation but in close Atlantic cooperation and understanding.

He added that he felt that "continentalism, either of the European or North American variety is not the answer."

Finally I believe "only the United States can give the effective lead required for Atlantic unity," he said. "Without her active participation and support nothing can be done, at least on the broad front which is essential. Without her leadership we will be driven back to a national or continental solution for the organization of security and for progress."

Stop Harmful Shoe Imports Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, thoughtful Americans have been understandably greatly concerned about the flow of cheap goods from abroad which are having such a disastrous and dangerous impact upon some of our domestic industries, their faithful employees and upon the national economy.

While I think that most of us realize the advantages and needs of truly reciprocal foreign trade and are desirious of maintaining healthy, mutual trade relations with other nations, we are not willing to accept the thesis that foreign trade should be a "one-way street," as it has become in many instances today.

It is true that we have substantially expanded our own exports and foreign trade and this would normally bring us measurable benefits. But when we realize that a very sizable portion of our exports stem from foreign aid programs, grants, and loans to other nations, do not necessarily involve reciprocal trade benefits, and often entail additional charges upon our already sorely afflicted and heavily burdened taxpayers, admittedly, this situation must give us some pause.

It is also true that many nations which are enjoying liberal access to American markets are at the same time firmly closing their choicest markets to American goods and thus barring them from many foreign countries.

Even at a time of the peek prosperity which our country is currently enjoying, there are many of our industries here faced with injurious, cutthroat competition from overseas which, because of their relatively low costs and standards, we cannot possibly absorb without damage to our competitive posture.

In the longrun, and even in the shorter run, the continued flow of cheap imports is bound to produce undesirable effects upon our economic system, and weaken certain industries, and result in unemployment.

From time to time under current trade policies we continue to make substantial concessions to foreign importers and traders.

Recently we adopted guidelines relating to the American selling price valuation of certain footwear and, in addition, data as to the imports of such footwear.

The American selling price basis of value is defined in the tariff act under section 402e and 402a(g) and the choice of these two definitions is determined by the final list status of the merchandise. When the merchandise is not on the list, section 402e applies. When it is on the list, section 402a(g) applies.

I think that we need something more than palliatives to help our shoe industry. We need safeguard amendments of the trade bill.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the shoe industry, which is being directly harmed, should be greatly concerned to see foreign competition increasing and new increases forecast.

It seems clear to me that Congress must sooner or later give careful attention to the operation of our trade laws, as I urged at the time the trade bill was pending, and as soon as it can be done, I would suggest that our appropriate committees conduct investigations to ascertain the impact and the damage and injury that has been done, and is being done every day, to domestic industries by the large influx of foreign goods coming into our markets. If proper safeguards had been written into the trade bill in the first instance, we would not now be suffering from these deplorable conditions.

At least the facts of the situation should be vigorously sought so that we may know definitely the scope and extent of the danger to our American economy and to the prosperity of our industries, resulting from cutthroat competition from abroad, which under our standards of wages and living, our industries and our economy could never possibly absorb without serious damage to our economic system and dire threats to our prosperity.

I hope and urge that the leadership of the House may take note of this situation and, as soon as possible, provide complete inquiry and analysis by our House committee looking toward the development of appropriate legislation to neutralize the grave danger of irreparable damage from continuing unfair foreign competition to our industry and economic structures that is at present threatening the stability and prosperity of many in this great American shoe industry.

It is late for us to act in these matters to be sure. We might well have acted, as I had urged so vehemently when the trade bill was pending. But it is better late than never, so let us act, and act vigorously now.

Ben Cole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, July 10, was the 50th birthday of a fellow Hoosier, my good friend Ben Cole, a member of the Congressional Standing Committee of Correspondents.

Ben is chief of the Washington bureau of the Indianapolis Star, the Muncie Star, and the Arizona Republic. He has been with the Star since 1944, serving as statehouse reporter and city editor in Indianapolis and has been chief of the Washington bureau since 1949.

Ben is a well-known and respected figure on Capitol Hill, not only to the members of the Indiana congressional delegation and their staffs, but to a wide circle of colleagues and congressional friends on both sides of the aisle. It was men like Ben of whom the author of "The Newspaper Guy" was thinking when he wrote his famous lines:

"Some day I'll pass by the Great Gates of
Gold,
And see a man pass through unquestioned
and bold.
'A Saint?' I'll ask, and old Peter'll reply:
'No, he carries a pass—he's a newspaper
guy.'"

Ben has always exemplified the best and finest in the field of journalism. His fellow Hoosiers and his many friends are proud of him, and I wish him many more happy and productive years in the profession he serves so well, for his papers, his State, and his country.

Airline Strike Should Be Settled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the continuance of the airlines strike is not only causing great inconvenience to the public but also is resulting in substantial financial loss to a great many business firms which is evidenced by many communications I am receiving from constituents.

Both management and labor would gain much in public good will if they would bring this unfortunate strike to a rapid conclusion, because from the tone of the communications that I have so far received the general public is quite out of sympathy with the present state of affairs.

I am also sure that there are reasonable men on both sides of this issue and it is my hope that they will not let this unhappy situation continue.

Under unanimous consent I include at this point some of the many telegrams which are self-explanatory:

SEATTLE, WASH.

Present airlines strike very crippling to this area and to us. Our extensive use of airmail in connection with national operations is essential. Each day it becomes more critical. Since administration may have no legal power to act we think Congress should take cognizance of this bad situation particularly in view of President's Committee having made a realistic recommendation which was accepted by management.

SAFECO INSURANCE COMPANIES,
W. L. CAMPBELL, *Chairman*.

SEATTLE, WASH.

I know you realize the great loss accruing from the airline strike which is particularly detrimental in the far Pacific Northwest. Not only is the economic loss terrific but relates itself to all business in many areas. Any help you can give to get this matter in high level hands for the purpose of seeking a solution will be appreciated.

PACIFIC NATIONAL BANK
OF SEATTLE,
CHARLES F. FRANKLAND,
Chairman of the Board.

SEATTLE, WASH.

Airline strike is producing extreme dislocation of entire economy this region. Lack of governmental action most conspicuous. Either executive or legislative action urgently needed.

DONALD H. YATES.

SEATTLE, WASH.

As you know, the airlines strike is crippling the Northwest. Hope you can do something about it.

SIMPSON TIMBER CO.

SEATTLE, WASH.

Current airlines strike seriously hampering our ability to deliver aircraft and missile equipment for both military and civil use. Would appreciate all possible help in settling strike.

UNITED CONTROL CORP.,
J. E. NAVARIE, *President*.

SEATTLE, WASH.

I know this is asking a great deal, but anything your office can do to encourage a settlement of the present airlines strike will be greatly appreciated by all of us in the travel and hotel industry. Having our two main lines of transportation to the east closed down, particularly at this time of the year, is really a serious handicap.

WASHINGTON STATE HOTEL & MOTEL
ASSOCIATION,
TOM GILDERSLEEVE,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

SEATTLE, WASH.

Continuancy of airlines strike seriously hampering our coastwide business because of inability to staff and line executives to travel by air. This wire to urge you to put forth your best efforts to bring about reasonable settlement to get the planes flying.

LOOMIS ARMORED CAR SERVICE,
WALTER F. LOOMIS,
Chairman of the Board.

SEATTLE, WASH.

Our company, Western Tours, in providing the exclusive bus service between SEATAC and Seattle is seriously involved in the airlines strike. Business is down approximately 70 percent and drastic personnel cut has been necessary. We respectfully request your personal action to solve this very crippling situation as soon as possible. Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. SEWELL.
EDWIN O. CEDERGREN.
ALFRED R. ROCHESTER.

Sowing Cultural Seed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to give a moment of attention to the recent story by Howard Taubman in the New York Times on the grants that have been made by the Office of Education under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Mr. Taubman's article reflects the imagination and flexibility with which the Office of Education has pursued the implementation of title III.

Praise must also go to the many localities which have spent much time, effort, and imagination in developing programs than can broaden the scope of education in the United States.

Mr. Taubman's story follows:

[From the New York Times, July 12, 1966]

Sowing Cultural Seeds—A Generous Uncle Sam Cultivates Regions Suffering Artistic Neglect

(By Howard Taubman)

Can you conjure a picture of the symbolic Uncle Sam in top hat, waving jauntily, with tailcoat flying in the wind as he strode through America scattering seeds with the exuberance of a Johnny Appleseed? That is how the Federal Government begins to loom in the imagination as one studies the 336 new projects approved by the Office of Education in its second batch of grants to local schools under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Under Title III the Government may assist in providing vitally needed educational services not ordinarily available and may help to develop model programs.

Although the 336 projects involve $23.8-million in Federal grants, their nature and quality impresses one even more than their magnitude. "For unmet cultural needs" is a phrase that recurs in the description of the programs. One can only hope that the Government will reap as generously as it sows.

Two categories of grants are especially significant and bear promise of great rewards. One encompasses projects that encourage doing. The other concentrates on regions remote from artistic traffic and on school populations that for ethnic and economic reasons suffer acute cultural neglect. In some cases projects seek to cope with all these challenges.

The programs for doers embrace the sciences and humanities and some touch on problems of local government; those in the arts are particularly fascinating in their potentialities.

GRANTS FOR TUSKEGEE

Tuskegee, Ala., has received two grants in music. One of $58,400 is for an institute for 200 talented high-school students, including pianists, string and wind players and vocalists, who will receive intensive instruction at Auburn University in the fundamentals of music, performance techniques and repertory. The other, funded with $71,500, will explore new methods of instruction on the strings among children 4 to 6 years old in five counties and 10 school systems. One dares to envisage the result: a sudden spurt of musical awareness and achievement in unexpected parts of Alabama.

Techniques developed on different continents will be tested in California. In El Monte 125 fourth-graders will engage in an experiment with the Suzuki method of learning to play an instrument, thanks to a $30,000 grant. Shinichi Suzuki is a Japanese violin teacher who has established a system of teaching by listening and playing and has achieved considerable international fame.

In Madera there will be a pilot program in the approach of Carl Orff, the German composer and teacher, for the cultivation of musical sensitivity through simple instruments, speech, drama, rhythmics and singing. The grant is for $10,400.

Campbell, with $8,200, will devote itself to an American specialty, the musical stage, in a summer workshop for 120 high-school students.

The doers will be scattered across the land. Sarasota, Fla., is to use $48,600 to establish a clinic of instrumental performance with groups of three to eight youngsters meeting for one and a half hours a day five days a week to play in ensembles and to give weekly concerts. Haverhill, Mass., has $18,000 for a Saturday-morning center of art, music and drama, which will top off a year's endeavors with a summer arts festival.

Huntington, L.I., receives $55,800 to plan integration of the performing arts into the curriculum. Allentown, Pa., has $45,600 to plan a center with a museum, theater and active participation in art, music, drama, and dance. One of the largest grants, $176,500, goes to New York for 60 centers that will offer art classes to children from the third grade to the ninth grade, whether they attend public or private schools.

A child in the heart of the biggest American city can be as culturally deprived as a youngster in a remote village, but sooner or later, one likes to think, public-spirited individuals and institutions would be moved to do something for him. Such vigorous, activating forces have a lot more trouble getting started in a remote village, and it is heartening to note that the Government is becoming the deus ex machina.

Broken Arrow, Okla., has $15,200 to create "a cultural enrichment center." Seattle receives $17,000 to take its Symphony and other musical groups to rural and sparsely populated areas in the state of Washington.

Eastman, Ga., gets $30,600 to plan a fine-arts curriculum for grades one to 12 in six school systems in relatively isolated central Georgia. Mesa, Ariz., obtains $90,400 to plan a center that will, among other things, "stimulate interest in art and music among relatively isolated schools." Harrison, Ariz., has $55,300 to plan instruction in the visual and performing arts, especially for youngsters with creative potential.

The possibilities for the future of the arts in America seem breathtaking—thousands upon thousands of the new generation discovering the pleasures of doing as well appreciating.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Friday, July 15, 1966

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed agriculture appropriations and took up foreign aid bill. See Congressional Program Ahead.

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 15086–15093

Bills Introduced: 4 bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3617–3620. **Page 15086**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 3466, to change the name of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, N. Dak., to the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant (S. Rept. 1372);

S.J. Res. 167, authorizing organization of an International Conference on Water for Peace in the U.S. in 1967 (S. Rept. 1373);

S. 3498, facilitating the carrying out of obligations of the U.S. under the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States (S. Rept. 1374); and

H.R. 318, making excise tax on tires and tubes payable when such items are delivered to a retail store or outlet (S. Rept. 1375). **Pages 15085, 15086–15087**

Senate

Bill Placed on Calendar: H.R. 15750, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, was ordered placed on calendar. **Page 15085**

Agriculture Appropriations: By 77 yeas to 2 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Senate passed with amendments H.R. 14596, fiscal 1967 appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and related agencies, after taking the following additional actions on amendments:

Modified Montoya amendment to increase from $100 million to $110 million necessary expenses for the food stamp program and to increase from $25 million to $30 million additional funds appropriated under this heading in the fiscal 1966 Agricultural Appropriation Act (P.L. 89–316); and modified Hart amendment to provide $2.5 million additional funds for school lunch program for special assistance to needy schools; and

Rejected: By 28 yeas to 53 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), modified Brewster amendment to restrict certain sugar price support loans or payments to $50,000 to any one person or entity.

Senate insisted on its amendments, asked for conference, and appointed as conferees Senators Holland, Russell (Georgia), Ellender, Young (North Dakota), and Mundt. **Pages 15093–15123**

Foreign Aid: Senate made its unfinished business S. 3584, proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1966. **Page 15154**

Treaty Reported: Protocols to the Northwestern Atlantic Fisheries Convention of 1949 (Ex. I, 89th Cong., 2d sess.), was reported (Ex. Rept. 7). **Pages 15085–15086**

Nominations: 55 postmaster and numerous Air Force nominations were received. **Pages 15155–15156**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. **Pages 15111, 15122**

Program for Monday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 3:45 p.m. until noon Monday, July 18, when it will consider its unfinished business, S. 3584, foreign assistance. **Pages 15154, 15155**

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Committee continued its executive consideration of H.R. 14929, proposed Food for Freedom Act, but did not conclude action thereon, and will meet again for its further consideration on Wednesday, July 20.

SMALL BUSINESS

Committee on Banking and Currency: The Small Business Subcommittee held hearings to review the small business investment company program. Witnesses were Bernard L. Boutin, Administrator, and Howard Greenberg, Deputy Administrator, both of the Small Business Administration; Donald P. Moen, Marathon Battery Co., Wausau, Wis.; and Grogan Lord, National Association of Small Business Investment Companies.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

Committee on Commerce: The Surface Transportation Subcommittee continued its hearings on S. 1729, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for issuance of certificates of exemption to cooperative and shippers associations upon application and proof of eligibility, having as its witnesses Frank A. Smith, Transportation Association of America; Albert B. Kelley, Transportation and Communications Department, U.S.

Appendix

Optometric Care in the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, last month I commended to your attention and the attention of my colleagues the remarks made by the new deputy mayor of New York City, Robert Price, before the recent Governor's conference on decisions for progress. See Congressional Record of June 15, page A3234. In his talk, "Is City Government Obsolete?" he offered seven goals of urban government. One goal concerned "more than adequate health" facilities.

I am happy to say that New York City Mayor Lindsay, taking the health care goal as one for his administration, has set about to make this goal a reality. Residents of New York City are fortunate to have as their new health services administrator, commissioner of health, and chairman of their board of health, an outstanding public health physician, Dr. Howard J. Brown. Before this recent appointment, Dr. Brown served as director of the Gouverneur Ambulatory Care Unit of Beth Israel Hospital in New York City.

A graduate of Western Reserve University School of Medicine, he was certified in 1956 by the American Board of Internal Medicine. In the 10 years elapsing, his services have earned the respect of his fellow physicians and honors from other health care professions. In 1965, for example, he received the Public Health Association of New York Merit Award.

Dr. Brown's most recent award came to him last month in Boston during the 69th Annual Congress of the American Optometric Association. On June 23 he received the Apollo Award, the highest honor bestowed by the optometric profession. Its symbol re-creates the form of the mythical Phoebus Apollo, Greek god of light. It is granted only to those individuals who have made outstanding contributions to the visual welfare of mankind.

When AOA president, Dr. V. Eugene McCrary of College Park, Md., presented the award, he noted Dr. Brown's unique contributions in the public health field which include a vital social and professional concern for and service to the vision care needs of the American people. He also cited Dr. Brown's services as an associate professor of community medicine at Mt. Sinai Medical School and medical consultant to the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Upon receiving the Apollo Award, Dr. Brown said:

I am very proud to be with you today and to receive this award. I would be still prouder if I felt that I indeed deserved it. This award should go to the members of the staff of the Optometric Center of New York who have provided optometric services to the indigent of the Lower East Side of New York. The quality and completeness of their care of patients and the courtesy with which they treat patients have led me to have a deep respect for optometrists and optometry. There have been those who have criticized the service that was developed on the Lower East Side of New York, but on every occasion we have asked them to come and examine the service in terms of quality of care, completeness of care and kindness of attention to patients. In each instance, after such a visit there has been no more criticism. Perhaps I am getting the reward for simply being able to recognize outstanding service when I see it.

Though we are entering a new era of health services in this country, we are clearly moving toward a point where the government is guaranteeing to all citizens the right to a full range of health services. We are presently engaged in implementing this right in New York City under the provisions of the fine bill passed by the New York State legislature. If this change were occurring in the 1920's or the 1930's we might simply characterize the role of government as a fee payer. However, in view of the progress of science, it is important that government do more than pay, but take responsibility to see that people get their appropriate share of all services.

Now this has particular relevance to optometry. We could never deliver the needed eye services in this country without the valuable help of your profession. In terms of scientific standards it would be important to note that without optometry, ophthalmology, as a profession that treats medical disease and performs surgery, could not exist.

Anyone then who is concerned about care for people and care provided under scientific standards must concern himself with the future of optometry. I would long for the day when optometry is integrated both in terms of education and in terms of clinical performance with the other health disciplines. I believe this day will come because it is so essential.

So again, let me tell you how honored I am to receive this award. I appreciate it very much.

Federal Versus Local

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a very able analysis written by Dr. Henry C. Wallich—of Yale University, and a member of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers—in the June 27 issue of Newsweek on the problem of Federal-State-local relations.

He points to the grave dilemma of the growing demands on our city and State governments and their inability to meet many of these demands because of limited resources resulting in the gradual loss of political control over local problems to the Federal Government. His conclusions agree with my own and that of the Nation's Governors who at their annual conference in Los Angeles last week declared that the logical answer to this dilemma is the institution of some form of unconditional grants of Federal money to the States.

I am pleased to say that I introduced a bill last October which embodies one form of such unconditional grants based on the Heller-Pechman tax-sharing plan, and which now represents one of the three approaches that has received the endorsement of the Nation's Governors.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Dr. Wallich, be inserted in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HENRY C. WALLICH ON FEDERAL VERSUS LOCAL

Mayor John Lindsay's epic battle for the budget of New York City has laid bare the malaise that afflicts state and local finances throughout the United States. The finances of New York City have been mismanaged, to be sure. But if that were all, Mayor Lindsay's troubles would be minor. The real problem is one of financial incompatibility between the services a large city should provide and the resources upon which it can draw. This may end in a divorce of local responsibility to provide services from political power to control them. If the mayor of a large city cannot raise the money he needs to do his job, control of the city's affairs inevitably slips from his and his constituents' hands.

As Mayor Lindsay—and many of his colleagues elsewhere—contemplates his deficit, he does not have far to look for the causes. Many people want to work in the city, but only the very rich—and the very poor—can afford to live and raise their children there. The city must provide a rich menu of services to many people who do not pay for them. So the mayor tries to reach out into the suburbs to tax the commuter. There he encounters the resistance of the state government.

COMPETITION IN LAXITY

New York State is no ogre. Like all other states, it contributes heavily already to the support of its cities. Nationwide, states finance their cities to the tune of almost 30 percent of local general revenues. But neither New York nor any other state operates a gold mine. And other resources are hard to come by for state governments, much in contrast to their big Federal brother.

At first blush this seems hard to understand. When one compares the usual tax rates of states with the rates charged by the Federal government, the impression is that the states ought to have a much easier time increasing their revenues than would the Federal government. It is easier to double a 3 per cent sales tax than a 48 per cent corporate-profits tax.

To argue this line is to overlook the competition in tax laxity to which our states are committed. The state or city which pushes its taxes out of line loses its industries. The New York Stock Exchange has been trying to make that clear to Mayor Lindsay. Hence the difficulty in raising state and local revenues. Hence the difficulty in providing the services that must be paid out of those revenues.

A POWER VACUUM

The Federal government, which abhors a vacuum, may feel tempted to step in and fill the gap. Already it has injected itself by making conditional grants to the states for amounts now budgeted at $14.7 billion. Each grant twists the arms, more or less gently, of some state or local authority: "Do this, do that, or do without the money." Much of the time, no doubt, the Federal government's standards are reasonable, The Federal government, by and large, is honest and competent. Not all state and local administrations are. But if we want limited government, we cannot let the Federal government acquire unlimited power.

A logical way out of this dilemma is shown by the widely discussed Heller-Pechman plan providing for unconditional grants of Federal money to the states. The plan uses the great financial power of the Federal revenue system, but does not let it be translated into political power over state and local authorities. The plan incurs the risk that some states may not make the "right" use of the money. They may even take advantage of it to cut their own taxes. The answer to critics who make this point, located mainly on the political left, must be that the money after all is the taxpayers'. If the taxpayers of some states prefer the money to the services, why shouldn't that be their privilege?

Senator JAVITS of New York has offered a bill embodying the main features of this plan. The humiliating struggle between the City and the State of New York demonstrates the urgency of channeling some Federal money, with no strings attached, to the local level. The Federal government, comfortably off as it is, may feel that its present method of tied grants has worked well enough. But here is one case where to leave well enough alone means to let things go from bad to worse.

A Tribute to Wilfred E. Roosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that Superintendent of Mails Wilfred Roosa last winter completed 53 years of service as a postal employee in the city of Passaic. This is a record of service in the Passaic Post Office. Since I was out of the country at the time, the occasion of his retirement escaped my notice.

It is unsung heroes like Wilfred Roosa, doing their jobs with dedication from day to day, who do so much to keep the wheels of our government moving.

The people of his area have every reason to be grateful to him for his splendid service.

Fair Housing Law Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the need for a fair housing law is clear as we assert our belief in the principle of equal opportunity.

The Denver Post, as a matter of fact, regards the fair housing proposal before Congress as a bare minimum. To speak of weakening its provisions in order to obtain passage, in the newspaper's opinion, is "laughable."

Colorado already has a strong housing law, and the newspaper believes it has been instrumental in bettering the racial climate in the State. The law has served as an emotional safety valve, for Negro families are now assured of the right to move if they wish.

Every large city needs such a safety valve, the Post contends. And unless the States act more swiftly than they have so far, only a national law will meet the need.

The complete editorial follows:

[From the Denver Post, June 23, 1966]

NATION NEEDS A FAIR HOUSING LAW

Elsewhere on this page, Columnist Joseph Alsop reports on how expanding Negro ghettos are certain to change the face of most of America's large cities, "if present trends continue." What Alsop doesn't say is that the only thing that can change those trends is a national fair housing law.

Such a law won't make any difference in Colorado—we already have a stronger, more effective law than any Congress is likely to pass. It won't even make much physical difference for several years in the rest of the nation. What it could do is make far-reaching change possible—eventually—and improve the nation's racial climate immediately.

A potential national fair housing law is contained in Title IV of the 1966 civil rights bill now pending in Congress. It is not much of a law. In fact, it is downright laughable to hear congressmen say it must be weakened in order to pass.

Principal means of enforcement would be civil suits filed by those who believe they have been victims of discrimination. Can anyone imagine the average Negro ghetto-dweller filing a civil suit against someone who refused to rent or sell him a home? Particularly when the amount of damages he could collect is limited by the law to $500? In most of the nation, even if a Negro complainant won, that $500 wouldn't cover his legal fees. If a court awarded less than the legal maximum damages, a Negro home-seeker could easily lose his shirt while winning his case.

How much weaker, we wonder, would opponents like to have that law?

Actually, if the bill is to do any good, it should provide for enforcement by the Justice Department or some other federal agency. There is a provision in the bill permitting the Justice Department to sue for compliance wherever it detects a "pattern" of discrimination. This may be useful against developers of tract housing.

Presumably it was this feature that led William J. Levitt, president of the giant homebuilding firm that has built whole new towns in four Eastern states, to testify before a House Judiciary subcommittee that the bill "would work, and work well." He favors the bill—if it covers all builders.

But we cannot see how the bill as written would really touch the individually-owned, used homes which make up 80 per cent of more of the housing market.

Yet, the nation—particularly its cities—needs a really effective fair housing law.

For the long run, such a law is essential to prevent the nation's largest cities from becoming super-ghettos. (The law itself will not, of course, do that job. But it will so widen the area of freedom in housing that education can do the job.)

And for the short run, such a law would vastly improve the racial climate in America's city ghettos.

Colorado, which has had an effective fair housing law for some 14 months now, provides proof.

Nothing very spectacular has happened in Colorado as a result of that law. The number of Negro families who have used it to flee the ghetto can probably be counted in dozens.

But the racial climate has changed. All Negro families in Colorado now know they are free to move "out" if they wish. So we hear no cries here, as we do from places like Watts, that "Whitey has fenced us in." The Colorado law now holds open a safety valve on Colorado's urban ghettos.

It seems fair to say that every large American city in the nation needs a safety valve like that. Certainly they all need some way to change their present ghetto-building trends. And unless the states act more swiftly than they have so far, only a national law will meet the need.

Chicago's District of Columbia Air Link

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Aviation Agency's announced intention to ban all nonstop flights into Washington's National Airport from cities more than 500 miles distant is clearly unreasonable. There are obviously more equitable alternative ways to alleviate the serious congestion at National Airport.

The following editorial from the July 14 edition of the Chicago Daily News sums up very well, I believe, the case against this arbitrary decision by the FAA:

CHICAGO'S DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AIR LINK

The Midwest will be the principal loser if the Federal Aviation Agency's order halting certain nonstop flights to Washington's National Airport is not modified. Landing privileges would be limited to flights originating within a 500-mile radius of Washington; others beyond that limit, including some 15 a day from Chicago, would be diverted to Dulles Airport, which is much farther from the capital.

Members of Congress from Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin and Iowa have rightly protested the order. They point out that landing at Dulles would add from one to two hours—depending on highway traffic conditions—to the travel time between Chicago and Washington. National is located only four miles from the White House and thus offers speedy transportation to and from the capital.

Granting the FAA's contention that the heavy air traffic at National must somehow be curtailed, we believe the problem should be resolved in other ways. The arbitrary elimination of flights from Chicago and other points outside the prescribed limit discriminates against them unfairly, while unduly favoring such cites as New York and Boston.

Chicago is the main transfer point for many Midwesterners seeking the fastest air route to Washington. Since Washington is the capital of all the country and not merely of the Eastern states, this fact should be taken into consideration by the FAA.

A more equitable solution would be to determine how many flights National can safely handle per day, and divide them up among all the airlines now providing nonstop service to the airport—regardless of the distance covered. The quotas should be based on the volume of passenger traffic. This would assure Chicago and other outlying cities of a fair share of the National traffic, instead of penalizing them for the accidents of geography that place them beyond the 500-mile pale.

Poverty Aid Can Be Embarrassing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, how well-to-do and self-supporting school districts are being shoved unneeded financial assistance under the Federal handout programs is disclosed in an illuminating article in the Christian Science Monitor of recent date. The article by staff correspondent Josephine Ripley is entitled, "Poverty Aid Can be Embarrassing," and follows:

POVERTY AID CAN BE EMBARRASSING

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—Giving away a billion dollars isn't easy.

State boards of education are learning this, as they hand out poverty grants under the flabby distribution formula in the administration's elementary and secondary school aid program.

This program is designed to funnel money into school districts with large concentrations or low-income families with large numbers of school-age children.

But the basis of computation has turned out to be so broad and unreliable that some of the nation's richest communities have been startled beneficiaries of poverty grants for their schools.

One person, however, is not surprised, Rep. EDITH GREEN (D) of Oregon vigorously opposed the formula from the first. It would give more to the richer states and less to the poorer ones which need it most, she argued.

But even she is amazed at the extent to which thousands upon thousands of dollars have been flowing to communities more noted for their millionaires than their pockets of poverty.

VANISHED CHILDREN

More particularly, since this money was intended to go specifically to children from families with an annual income of less than $2,000.

Yet this is the way it has worked, in some instances:

Garden City, N.Y., a well-to-do Long Island community, was surprised to find itself "eligible" for $35,000 in poverty grants under the program.

How did this happen? The United States Office of Education, when queried, made this explanation: Mainly because the 1960 census, on which the whereabouts of indigent families is determined, showed a concentration of poor families on an Air Force base on the outskirts of Garden City.

That was in 1960. The base has since been closed. But the little children who aren't there still entered into the allocation formula. Many communities, whether they like it or not, suddenly find themselves eligible under this criteria.

Beverly Hills, Calif., didn't like it. City officials indignantly disclaimed eligibility for the poverty grant of $82,000 which they were due to receive.

They said they could not identify the "poor children" whom this money was supposed to benefit. They refused to accept it.

Santa Ana, Calif., qualified for a $400,000 grant. This affluent and politically conservative community promptly refused the money on the ground that it would lead to federal control of their schools.

Rep. HENRY S. REUSS (D) of Wisconsin rose up to protest when Whitefish Bay, Wis., a well-known millionaire's resort, came in for a $35,000 school aid grant.

LEGALITY CHALLENGED

To be eligible, a community must have a minimum of 100 impoverished children, he pointed out. Whitefish Bay has only 89, according to his count.

Mr. REUSS, whose district includes the city of Milwaukee with its large concentration of poor, challenged the legality of the grant in a three-page letter to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner.

Whitefish Bay, nevertheless, accepted $25,000 of the grant to conduct summer remedial courses.

Representative GREEN warned, at the time the bill was passed, that the distribution formula was automatically stacked in favor of the richer states.

Aid is computed on the basis of the number of poor children, times the amount of the state expenditure per pupil. The highly industrialized Northern states, generally richer, pay more per pupil for education, hence receive more under that formula.

Mrs. GREEN often compared Westchester County, N.Y., hardly noted for its poverty, with Sunflower County, Miss., to make her point.

A check with the United States Office of Education shows how it actually worked out.

Westchester County qualified for $2,812,000 in aid on the basis of 7,692 poor children. New York State pays $709 per pupil toward its schools.

Sunflower County, with 9,543 children in the poverty bracket received $1,156,000. It pays $273 per pupil.

COMPLEX UNDERTAKING

Another apparent inequity turned up when high-toned Grosse Pointe, Mich., received $117,500 as its share under the aid formula—almost exactly the same amount allocated to the depressed town of Inkster in the same state.

These are some of the glaring inconsistencies and inequities which have cropped up in the first year of administration of this massive and otherwise highly successful school aid program.

In the main, it is thought to have worked remarkably well, considering the complexities of this unprecedented undertaking.

The Achilles' heel of the program appears to be the formula for computing aid.

Authorities at the Office of Education who have been working on this Title I section of the bill since the beginning blame its inequities on "a combination of old data [the 1960 census] and the lack of minimum eligibility requirements" which would preclude allocations to wealthy communities.

As it is now, "a very wealthy district can get a small allocation because there is no floor—no minimum for a cutoff," according to one spokesman.

The 1960 census has been a big stumbling block. It has resulted in computations based on nonexistent poor—on families who have moved since then to other places.

Also, while school districts are mentioned in the law, it has been necessary to compute the concentrations of poor on a countywide rather than a school district basis.

HORNET'S NEST

School districts are rapidly being consolidated, for one thing, and some parts of the country operate their school system on a county basis anyway.

"And once you have made an allocation on a county basis, then almost any district within that county becomes eligible," the Office of Education has found.

It is up to the state board of education to make the distribution within the county.

This responsibility has churned up a "hornet's nest politically," as someone put it. The California board "took a beating" in the case of Beverly Hills, and other state boards across the country have also felt the political heat.

It has been suggested to Congress by the Office of Education that current welfare statistics would provide a more accurate count of the poor than the 1960 census.

By that is meant statistics on Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

"AFDC figures are current. We know who needs help. With this information as a basis, aid could go where it is most needed," said one authority.

He feels that states would go along with this. "It would get them off the hook."

As for Mrs. GREEN, "I agree," she said in an interview, "that something besides the census figures should be used. They are obviously out of date. Studies show that about one-fourth of the population moves once a year."

But she feels this is not the only solution to the program's inequities. She still insists that the states which spend more for education will get more, rather than those who spend less and need more.

An amendment to the act, by Rep. ALBERT H. QUIE (R) of Minnesota, approved by the House Education Committee, would correct this to some extent. It would permit a state to compute its application for aid on the basis of its own expenditure per pupil, or on the national average expenditure whichever is the higher.

The national average is $484. This computation would benefit the Southern states, particularly, as many spend less per pupil than that.

Interracial Marriages: Hawaiian Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a recent study of interracial marriages in Hawaii challenges the commonly held belief that differences in racial and cultural background complicate marital adjustment. Mrs. Carol Jean Kaleialoha, of Honolulu, author of a 134-page graduate thesis, concludes that in Hawaii at least, "initial attraction and subsequent interaction evolve out of differences." She supports this new and intriguing concept with her findings that divorce rates among interracially married couples are lower than among all-Caucasian marriages in Hawaii, and that while the divorce rate for the Nation continues its upward trend, the divorce rate among interracial marriages in Hawaii remains relatively stable.

Mrs. Kaleialoha's thesis committee included the following University of Hawaii faculty members who are recognized authorities on race relations: Dr. Clarence E. Glick, chairman, thesis committee; Dr. Abe Arkoff, and Dr. Andrew W. Lind.

I submit for inclusion in the Congressional Record the newspaper article which summarizes this interesting sociological study. Written by Reporter Alf Pratte, it appeared in the June 28 issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

INTERRACIAL MARRIAGE: HAWAIIAN SUCCESS—STUDY OF CAUCASIAN-PART-HAWAIIAN COUPLES—UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII EXPLORES ADJUSTMENT IN INTERMARRIAGE

(By Alf Pratte)

The chances for a successful marriage between a Mainland "haole" woman and a "local boy" are just as good, if not better, than marriages between persons of the same background.

In short, this is the major theme in a 135-page thesis "Adjustment in Intermarriage Between Local Part-Hawaiian Men and Mainland Caucasian Women" written by Mrs. Carol Jean Kaleialoha.

Mrs. Kaleialoha, a native of Wisconsin who married James Kaleialoha, a part-Hawaiian, in 1961, prepared her thesis for the Department of Sociology at the University of Hawaii over a two-year period.

She points out that most research done on marriage implies that sociologically "like attracts like" and that cultural diversity contributes to difficulty in adjustment.

Mrs. Kaleialoha takes exception to this theory to show that in Hawaii, at least, "initial attraction and subsequent interaction evolve of differences."

To demonstrate her point in six chapters ranging from the "Development of the Part-Hawaiian Subculture" to "Marital Adjustment," Mrs. Kaleialoha interviewed 40 Caucasian and part-Hawaiian couples.

There have been about 4,500 marriages of this type in the last 10 years.

She stresses that her sample generally was "middle class," with all persons in their 20's or early 30's, married one year or more, intending to reside in Hawaii and having no less than a high school education.

She notes the "disruptive" side of intermarriages, showing statistics that divorce rates for Causcasian-part-Hawaiians here are slightly higher than the national average for all divorces.

Locally, however, the intermarriage divorce rates are lower than for all-Caucasian marriages. Furthermore, the national divorce rate is going up while the intermarriage divorce rate in Hawaii remains relatively stable.

The study showed that only about half of the Caucasian women came from "liberal or progressive backgrounds" and those from conservative homes generally rebelled against ently orientation," she said.

"Thus, although home lives were fairly stable, especially in regard to lack of death and divorce, this subtle rebellion served to emancipate these women partially from parnetal orientation," she said.

She writes that about half of the part-Hawaiian husbands had a liberal orientation and about half had an identification with the part-Hawaiian subculture.

"Most persons involved in intermarriage had personal needs satisfied within the marital context and did not prefer extensive contacts outside the home," Mrs. Kaleialoha said.

"In order for the couple to function satisfactorily, each mate would either directly fulfill the other's needs or arouse a latent admiration for some characteristic of the other."

As an example she said a wife who excelled scholastically and continued a professional career might be admired by her husband because he once desired this type of career but did not wish to attend school for several years or compete for grades in order to achieve the goal.

"Thus, he would be proud of his wife's motivation to excel and not feel himself to be in competition with her," she concluded.

Mrs. Kaleialoha also discovered that many of the women in her sample were "aggressive, independent, had a tendency to be assertive and ambitious."

Their husbands, on the other hand, are "relatively easy-going, independent, concerned with equality in marriage and stable in their positions of employment."

For future research, Mrs. Kaleialoha suggests that a psychological study be made of the factors she has studied from a sociological point of view.

"By studying other types of intermarriage, it could be determined whether or not adjustments varied when considering other kinds of subcultural crossings in different environmental settings."

Members of Mrs. Kaleialoha's thesis committee were Dr. Clarence E. Glick, chairman; Abe Arkoff and Andrew W. Lind.

An Old Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, let us hope with President Johnson that 1966 will be remembered as the year of "new conservation" for the United States.

The Sacramento Bee recalls that the President said, a few months ago, that this goal might be achieved, depending upon how aggressively the Government moves to reserve land for parks.

Land is not as available as it once was, the newspaper comments in an editorial, and acquiring land raises the old problem of finding the money to pay for it. But this is certainly the time, as the newspaper recalls the objective, for us to be sufficiently farsighted to protect the future by planning for it now.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the editorial for the Record:

FAMILIAR OLD PROBLEM

The federal government is engaged in one of the most ambitious parks and recreation programs in the history of the nation but the effort is suffering the malady common to just about any national program one could mention: Lack of money.

It comes about this way:

In years past, whenever the federal government felt inclined to establish a park or create a program for recreation, it would set aside land already under federal holdings.

However, accelerated urbanization is creating new problems in recreation and parks. There just is no land reserved for creation of these reserves, so the government must buy land.

Here is the rub. Much of the land which could be converted to parks and for recreation is in private ownership and land costs for such parcels are staggering. Complicating this even further, once the word gets around that the government is interested in a certain piece of land for development into a park or recreation area, the cost of the land soars.

President Lyndon B. Johnson commented in proposing his parks and recreation programs last February that depending upon how aggressively the government moves to reserve land for parks, 1966 may be remembered as the year of "new conservation" for America—as the year when men were farsighted enough to protect the future by commanding the present.

Law Against Desecration Should Be Enacted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today it was my privilege to introduce legislation designed to make illegal an act which, in itself, borders on the immoral.

The act to which I refer is the desecration of the flag of the United States of America.

This is the most liberal nation in the long history of mankind in the field of guaranteed right of expression and dissent.

The responsible exercise of this right is not only a privilege but a duty.

However, the irrational desecration of the flag, no matter by whom or for what reason, is an act that cannot and should not be condoned.

Most persons, I am sure, are not aware that there is no Federal law prohibiting this action except in the District of Columbia.

There are, without exception, I believe, State laws in each of the States prohibiting desecration of the flag.

Nonetheless, it would seem that these laws have not been sufficiently enforced to prevent this disgraceful act.

There is need for a Federal law to act as a further deterrent and to provide uniform coverage and penalty.

It may be that some would regard this as an invasion of States rights. However, I believe that since the American flag is the flag of all Americans, that because the regulations regarding its handling and display apply uniformly to all Americans, then, therefore, the penalty for disrespect and abuse should apply uniformly to all Americans.

In support of the argument for such a law, I would like to insert an editorial which appeared recently in the Nashville Banner and commend it to the attention and consideration of my colleagues:

FOR THE FLAG: LAW AGAINST DESECRATION SHOULD BE ENACTED

About the silliest argument that could be raised against the proposal of a federal law to forbid and punish desecration of the American Flag is the suggestion that such a statute might "violate the constitutional guarantee of free speech."

Any Congressman entertaining such a theory, as ground for legal objection, is fabricating his own gnat to strain at. There may be a relationship between words and actions of infamy—as between cause and effect—but they are not legally one and the same thing.

Technically, and in the eyes of the law, there is a difference between saying "Let's burn the house down," and setting fire to it.

The Flag has been desecrated time and again in this era of rampant hooliganism and apparently privileged seditious mischief. Subversive characters have spat on it, walked on it, burned it and torn it to shreds. They thereby were showing contempt not only for Old Glory, but for the thousands of young Americans who are fighting and dying for it.

Yet with a spate of measures before Congress to make that offense a federal crime, there still is no national law against it. The culprits go free!

For postage stamp irregularity you can go to jail. For mutilating money, penalty attaches—and nobody arises (or should) to suggest that punishment infringes the offender's "right" to talk himself blue (or Red) in the face.

The law proposed is eminently in order. One with teeth should be enacted and enforced to the letter.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate Captive Nations Week, it seems to me particularly ironic that on the same recent day when the Soviet Union canceled its participation in the annual track and field meet with the United States, our State Department announced a liberalization on travel by U.S. citizens to Communist countries with which we have no diplomatic relations.

Although the countries involved in this lift of travel restrictions are not among the east-central Europe captive nations, where travel by Americans is already relatively easy, there still is a most unsatisfactory inconsistency in the two announcements on the same day.

The Russians said they were canceling their athletes' trip to our country because of "our hatred for the American military who are perpetrating atrocities in Vietnam and our solidarity with the people of Vietnam."

That was the same day the State Department announced that persons in cultural, athletic, commercial, educational, public affairs, and professional fields will henceforth be eligible to apply for validation of their passports for travel to restricted areas. These are Communist China, North Vietnam, North Korea, Cuba, and Albania.

These simultaneous announcements also graphically illustrate a gradually diminishing concern on our part—by our Government and the people—over the plight of the people of the captive nations of east-central Europe.

Now is a time when Communist propaganda machinery is concentrating its attacks on alleged U.S. mistreatment of smaller nations, to recognize anew the Soviet imperialist record in east-central Europe. Now is a time for us to rededicate ourselves to the principles set forth in Public Law 90, enacted by Congress in July 1959 providing for the designation of the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week."

The resolution by which the law was enacted stated, in part:

> Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and
>
> Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence.

Problems Beyond the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, most of us in the Congress are aware and interested in the necessity for a revision of the Selective Service Act. In studying the problems involved, it is obvious that these problems are peripheral to overall manpower planning in this country. In this connection, the Oregon Journal, of Portland, Oreg., on Monday, July 11, 1966, published a most thought provoking editorial and with permission I print the same at this point in the RECORD:

PROBLEMS BEYOND THE DRAFT

A restudy of the military draft should be only a part of the business of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service which has just been appointed by President Johnson.

What we need is a national policy on manpower—military and civilian—or, alternatively, a decision not to have a universal manpower policy.

This is so because, barring a vast expansion of the armed forces which no one in his right mind should want, there simply are too many young men in the military age bracket to find places in the armed services. Today we have about 10 million men in the United States aged 19 to 26, and only about 3 million men in the armed forces. Only about half the young men of draft age ever wear a uniform. As our population grows, the surplus of men should become even greater. In only eight more years, it is estimated, the 19-to-26 age bracket will have swollen to 13.6 million men.

Therefore, no study just of the military draft is likely to answer satisfactorily one of the basic objections to the present draft system—that it takes Joe while passing over equally qualified Sam.

Recently suggestions have been revived that we should have a form of universal service, with every young man serving his country for a year or two in either a civilian or military capacity.

It may sound plausible on first hearing, but is this what we really want? After all, the regimented legions of Hitler Youth are one of the many ugly memories of Nazi Germany. Up to now the official line of the heads of the Peace Corps and the Vista volunteers, which might be regarded as examples of civilian alternatives to military service, has been that they wanted no part of having their organizations thought of as means for avoiding military duty.

On a purely practical basis, do we want to saddle the taxpayers with supporting every young man in the country for a year or two? Do we want to pay living allowances for the wives and children of those who are married? For that matter, if every boy is said to owe his country a couple of years of service, what about every girl? Do we want universal service for women, too?

These are some of the really fundamental questions involved in a study of the draft. Maybe the new commission will have to conclude that while the draft should be as fair as possible, nobody ever guaranteed that life itself would be 100 per cent fair, and that therefore we will have to continue calling some men while passing over others.

There is a nagging suspicion that President Johnson may have appointed his new commission in hopes, partly, of taking some of the heat out of the draft controversy until after the November elections. It is not directed to report until next Jan. 1.

The 20-member commission is heavy with people who have been closely associated with the system as it has operated in the past—people like John McCone, former director of the Central Intelligence Agency; Thomas Gates, ex-secretary of defense; David M. Shoup, former commandant of the Marine Corps, and even President Johnson's one-time press secretary and punching bag, George Reedy. But it also has at least one member—President Kingman Brewster of Yale University—who has been sharply critical of the present draft system. Its chairman, Burke Marshall, won wide respect when he was head of the civil rights division of the Justice Department.

The commission has the stature and background to make the "penetrating and broad-range study" which, according to his press secretary, the President wants. Nothing less will meet the need.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, the months have stretched into years since the conflict in South Vietnam took top priority on the front pages of the newspapers of this Nation.

Many nationally prominent figures have ventured to express their opinions for or against the U.S. role in this conflict and in recent months, the term, "hawks and doves," has become a more or less standard expression in governmental and news media circles.

Today, I received a letter from one of my constituents in Fond du Lac, Wis., expressing what I believe is the prevailing attitude of the people of my district toward the Vietnam war.

I believe this letter speaks well for itself, and would commend it to the attention of all of my colleagues of this body.

Under unanimous consent I include the attached letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FOND DU LAC, WIS.,
July 14, 1966.

Congressman JOHN RACE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RACE: I have been putting off long enough the writing of this letter informing you of my feelings in regard to Vietnam.

So much has been written, so many have been demonstrating (some without really knowing what for), so many condemn.

I hate war! But, I doubt that any human being will live a lifetime without seeing it or hearing of it or being affected by it in some way, because men are greedy, are hateful, and are lacking in love for others.

My younger brother is in Vietnam (with son and wife at home). We hope and pray that he'll come home on schedule in October, unharmed. My older brother has volunteered to go to Vietnam (with four boys and wife at home).

At times what I read makes me think seriously about whether the United States really belongs there. But I always return to the same conviction.

My general feelings are:

1. As long as South Vietnam is besieged with Northern murderers, torturers, and saboteurs, and is in need of support, the United States is morally committed to help them.

2. We didn't start this shameful mess; North Vietnam is the invader.

3. If we keep out of this fight, the same kind of infiltration will eventually reach our shores and our neighboring countries.

4. True, the United States has made many bunders, and has wronged many, but our sincere purpose is to give all men the freedom and comforts we have here.

5. I see many injustices perpetrated among our citizens (I am ashamed when I read of or see TV pictures of whites being so hateful toward fellow citizens because of their color), but I feel our country has never been better, and I wouldn't want to live anywhere else.

6. I support the raiding of North Vietnam oil targets and military targets. I feel they were carried out with the safety of the surrounding civilians uppermost in the minds of the planners.

7. I compare the bombing of oil supply depots in North Vietnam with Korea. I feel President Johnson made a wise decision, while perhaps President Truman might have erred in removing MacArthur. If MacArthur had been allowed to pursue his strategy we very likely would have ended the Korean war sooner, with far fewer casualties, and with a more stable situation than the shaky truce now in existence.

8. I am proud to be an American—I thank America for my freedom to speak, to worship, to think, to be educated, and to write this letter without fear of repercussion!

9. I thank you and all of our elected people who had the courage to run for office and the persistence to stick with all the problems presented.

10. And I thank whoever had the persistence to read this in its entirety.

Yours truly,
MRS. DAVE BARTOLUTTI.

Bobby Stephens Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Longview Morning Journal on June 18, 1966 concerning a longtime close friend of mine, Col. Robert L. Stephens. Also I include an article about Bobby Stephens Day.

I have known this very outstanding young man from the time he was a small boy. He always has been religious and a man of the highest character in all respects. His many talents and attainments warrant the signal honor he has received. Certainly he deserves the recognition he has been given.

The material follows:

BOBBY STEPHENS DAY

(By Carl L. Estes)

Any community is at its best when recognizing and honoring its citizens who have served their country faithfully and with distinction to themselves and the nation. So it is with Gilmer which places itself in the public spotlight Saturday by officially celebrating Bobby Stephens Day.

All East Texas is proud of Col. Robert L. Stephens, the celebrated and highly decorated "Silver Fox" of the U.S. Air Force who on May Day last year piloted a YF–12A jet interceptor at more than three times the speed of sound and brought the world's air speed record back to the United States from Russia.

For setting two new world flight records—a straight course speed record of 2,070.101 miles per hour, and an absolute sustained altitude record of 80,257.86 feet—Colonel Stephens and four of his test flight crew officers were decorated with the Distinguished Flying Cross, awarded by Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. John P. McConnell in a Pentagon ceremony in Washington.

Gilmer is literally booming with pride, for Colonel Stephens is a native of the Upshur County capital. He is the son of Mrs. Manie Stephens of Gilmer and the late Vernon J. Stephens. A veteran Air Force test pilot at 44, he is prematurely gray—the basis for his honored unofficial title of "Silver Fox" by which he is recognized among his Air Force friends and admirers.

Colonel Stephens and his co-pilot also were awarded the Flying Tiger Pilot Award for the world record-breaking flight, and received the 1965 Thompson Trophy Award. The MacKay Trophy for 1965, awarded by the National Aeronautic Association for the most meritorious flight of the year, will be presented to Colonel Stephens and his flight crew at Edwards Air Base on July 23 by General McConnell, Air Force chief of staff.

Gilmer and East Texas people are proud that Colonel Stephens' picture hangs in the Air Force Hall of Fame at Edwards Air Base, Calif., where he is officially known as Director of the Air Force Flight Test Center YF–12 test force.

The intrepid Gilmer colonel has been a test pilot longer than any other man in the Air Force today. He was the first military man to be elected a "fellow" in the international Society of Experimental Test Pilots.

He is a Legion of Merit Medal winner for his work a few years ago as director of testing of the famed F–104 fighter plane. As a test pilot and aeronautical engineer for 17 of his 22 years in uniform, he has been at Edwards Air Base a number of times over the past 12 years and now heads a group of more than 100 military and civilian test pilots, engineers, technicians and others engaged in flight testing the Mach 3 (three times the speed of sound) aircraft.

Colonel Stephens is a graduate of Gilmer High School, a graduate of Texas A&M University with an aeronautical degree, and holds a master's degree in aeronautics from Princeton University. He and his wife Joy have three lovely daughters, Lila, Linda and Lisa. His family will be with him for this happy occasion.

We here in Longview and throughout East Texas join in spirit with the proud people of Gilmer in honoring Colonel Stephens this Saturday. In all the activities of the day, we all shall be happy to have back home again, a distinguished citizen and one of the Air Force's finest, Col. Robert L. Stephens.

SPECIAL DAY IN HOMETOWN HONORS PILOT

GILMER.—As his home city put finishing touches on plans for Bobby Stephens Day scheduled today, the National Aeronautics Association revealed that Air Force Col. Robert L. Stephens and his record-setting pilots are to receive still further honors.

The MacKay Trophy, given for the most meritorious flight of the year, will go to the pilots and crew of the YF–12A jet interceptor in July 23, ceremonies at Edwards Air Force Base in California. It will be presented by Gen. John P. McConnell, U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff, Washington, D.C.

Veterans test pilot Stephens, known as "Bobby" to his hundreds of friends and admirers throughout East Texas, broke world speed and altitude records on May 1, 1965, when he and his co-pilot, Lt. Col. Daniel Andre, flew the YF–12A to 80,257.8 feet at a world speed of 2,070.1 miles per hour. This broke the previous record held by Russia—and on the Soviet Union's May Day at that.

On the same day, four other test pilots under Colonel Stephens' command, set nine world speed and altitude records in the same aircraft.

The MacKay Trophy will be awarded in the name of all the men who flew and set the nine world speed and altitude records.

Because of his distinguished career, the colonel and his family are being paid special honors all day Saturday in the town of his birth.

Festivities, under direction of Jack (Spot) Baird of Gilmer and Longview, and the Upshur County Chamber of Commerce, get under way at 9 a.m. Saturday at Kinel's Cafe where friends are invited to drop by for coffee and visit the colonel before he goes to the Strand Theater at 10 a.m. to show actual films of the record-breaking flight. He will narrate the film, and answer questions from his audience. Primarily an event for school children of Gilmer and all East Texas, the film will be shown again if interest warrants, Baird said.

At noon, an all-service club luncheon at Gilmer Country Club will spotlight Colonel Stephens and his family. This includes his mother, Mrs. Marie Stephens of Gilmer, his wife, Joy, and three daughters, Lila Lee, Linda Lou and Lisa; his mother-in-law, Mrs. Jewel Fuller of Baytown; and his two sisters, Verna Helen and Lila Blanche.

Gilmer Rotary, Lions and Kiwanis Clubs will combine their meetings for the luncheon, which will see such special guests as State Reps. George Hinson and John Allen, State Sen. Jack Strong, Cong. Lindley Beckworth and Ray Roberts.

Texas A&M University will send a representative from its engineering school, from which Colonel Stephens was graduated, and a San Antonio member of the famed Flying Tigers, also is expected.

The 745th Air Force Band from Barksdale Air Force Base will play at the luncheon as well as in concert from a bandstand on the city square beginning around 2 p.m.

Colonel Stephens will be presented from the bandstand at 2:30 p.m. and will speak briefly.

On display on the city square will be survival equipment from the 2nd Combat Support Group from Barksdale.

Colonel Stephens and his family also will be paid tribute by the Gilmer High School Class of 1946 which is holding its 20th class reunion Friday through Sunday.

What Price Welders?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the magazine Welding Engineer feels that the Federal Government is getting into areas about which it knows little or nothing, and cites its own field—that of welding—as an example.

The interesting editorial, which appeared in the June issue of the magazine, follows:

WHAT PRICE WELDERS?

(By T. B. Jefferson)

Among the many programs being established by the Office of Economic Opportunity, I have been told there is a welding training program in an eastern city. But "economic" it is not. On the basis of the initial program, it will cost about $16,000 a year to train four welders. This is figured on the $3,800 cost for a 12-week course in arc welding. As if the cost were not a sad enough commentary, there is also another one: the student is receiving training only with stick electrodes.

True, stick electrodes are going to be around for some time to come, but a good portion of present day demands for welders include those who are capable of handling a Mig gun. It is doubtful that the "advisors" who set the school up ever heard of Mig welding.

This is just another example of the government getting into some areas about which it knows little or nothing. I do not know why a welding school has to be set up in a city that has two of the best privately operated welding schools in the country, schools where experienced teachers would provide welding students with adequate training and virtually insure them a job at a cost of from one-fourth to one-eighth the money the OEO school is going to spend per student.

Perhaps we shouldn't complain too much about $3,800. On the overall OEO program they have spent more than $287 million to train 1,061 students in various fields. This is only a little more than $270,000 per student and this is only the first year's operation.

There is something economically unsound about a program that spends more on "educating" a student than the student will be able to earn in his working lifetime.

If we are going to throw the taxpayer's money away, it would seem that the best thing to do would be to put the $270,000 in the bank and then give the "student" the interest. He would have the $12,000 a year income for life and the taxpayer would know that his money was still around and was not being wasted or contributed to an ever-growing national debt.

Results of a Public Opinion Survey Taken in North Carolina's Eighth Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I am including the results of my annual public opinion survey among residents of the Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina.

I would like to express appreciation to all those who took the trouble to inform me of their stands on some of the important issues before this session of Congress. A total of 14,104 persons completed questionnaires and mailed them to my Washington office—a return of approximately 2,000 more than last year.

One especially gratifying aspect of this year's questionnaire is that so many persons—I would estimate a majority—added comments elaborating their views on one or more of the questions or on some other issue of concern to them.

It is interesting to observe that a majority of those answering voted against a proposed International Education Act but for an International Health Act, thus indicating that the answers were given after deliberation and thought.

Questionnaires were mailed to the broadest possible cross section of district residents and returns were received from all of the counties of the district. This would indicate that the responses constitute a fair reflection of the thinking of Eighth District residents.

The answers were tabulated by Data Management, Inc., of Washington, D.C., by the use of data processing equipment.

Following are the questions asked in the 1966 poll and the responses by numbers and percentages:

1. Which of the following policies would you like to see the U.S. follow in Vietnam?

	Percent
(a) Continue present policy (2,070)	14.7
(b) Withdraw all U.S. combat troops (2,193)	15.5
(c) Transfer U.S. troops to coastal enclaves and fight a strictly defensive war (653)	4.6
(d) Expand air attacks against North Vietnam to include industrial targets, close to the port of Haiphong to reduce the flow of war supplies to South Vietnam, and do whatever else is necessary to bring the war to a successful conclusion even at the risk of intervention by Red China (9,048)	64.2
No answer (982)	7.0

Please note that this questionnaire listing the foregoing questions was circulated before the present stepped-up air strikes against North Vietnam.

2. The President has proposed a new program under which the government would subsidize rents of families eligible for public housing but who would reside in housing units provided by non-profit, low-dividend, or cooperative housing owners. (The family would pay 25% of its income for rent and the Federal Government would pay the rest). Do you favor this proposal?

	Percent
Yes (1,708)	12.1
No (12,028)	85.3
No answer (368)	2.6

3. The President has proposed, in addition to existing financial aids to cities for urban renewal, etc., spending $2.3 billion during the next 6 years for what he calls a massive demonstration cities program. Certain cities around the country would be selected as "demonstration cities," and a federal coordinator would be assigned to each one. Do you favor this proposal?

	Percent
Yes (1,436)	10.2
No (12,339)	87.5
No answer (329)	2.3

4. The President is proposing the International Education Act of 1966, "to give children in other continents the same head start we are trying to give our own children." Do you favor this program?

	Percent
Yes (2,538)	18.0
No (11,034)	78.2
No answer (532)	3.8

5. The President is also proposing the Internation Health Act of 1966, "to wipe out smallpox, malaria, and control yellow fever over most of the world in this decade." Do you favor this program?

	Percent
Yes (7,836)	55.6
No (5,489)	38.9
No answer (779)	5.5

6. Do you believe the U.S. should provide funds to assist over-populated countries in promoting birth control?

	Percent
Yes (6,406)	45.4
No (7,026)	49.8
No answer (672)	4.8

7. Would you favor civil rights legislation—

(a) To give the Federal Government jurisdiction over *the selection of juries* in state courts to assure non-discriminatory jury selection?

	Percent
Yes (1,542)	10.9
No (12,026)	85.3
No answer (536)	3.8

(b) To confer authority of federal courts to prosecute persons charged with murdering, assaulting or intimidating those engaged in civil rights activities?

	Percent
Yes (3,406)	24.1
No (10,023)	71.1
No answer (675)	4.8

(c) To prohibit racial discrimination in the sale or rental of houisng?

	Percent
Yes (2,234)	15.8
No (10,994)	77.9
No answer (876)	6.3

8. Would you favor granting industry a tax credit for expenses incurred in operating on-the-job training programs for unskilled labor?

	Percent
Yes (8,886)	63.0
No (4,637)	32.9
No answer (581)	4.1

9. Would you favor recognition and admission to the United Nations of Red China?

	Percent
Yes (3,914)	27.8
No (9,177)	65.1
No answer (1,013)	7.1

10. Would you favor legislation which would invoke binding compulsory arbitration in labor-management disputes involving public services or which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest?

	Percent
Yes (10,567)	74.9
No (2,699)	19.1
No answer (838)	6.0

11. Do you favor four-year terms for Representatives in Congress?

	Percent
Yes (8,521)	60.4
No (4,968)	35.2
No answer (615)	4.4

12. The President is recommending an expansion of the anti-poverty program. The appropriation last year was $½ billion and the request this year is for an additional $1¾ billion. Would you recommend:

	Percent
(a) Increasing and expanding the program as recommended? (1,197)	8.5
(b) Ending the program altogether? (6,866)	48.7
(c) Reducing the money spent on it? (3,513)	24.9
(d) Keeping it at the present level? (2,942)	20.9
No answer (412)	2.9

13. Do you favor stricter laws regulating the rights of individuals to purchase firearms?

	Percent
Yes (8,912)	63.2
No (4,695)	33.3
No answer (497)	3.5

14. Do your favor federal standards for the transporting and sale of dogs, cats and other animals for use in medical research:

	Percent
Yes (8,995)	63.8
No (3,810)	27.0
No answer (1,299)	9.2

Captive Nations Week: 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN W. DYAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the eighth annual observance of our recognition of the plight of the captive nations. President Johnson, in a special captive nations proclamation, has asked us to consider the situation of peoples who still do not enjoy national independence and democratic liberties.

In the immediate aftermath of World War II the list of nations which had fallen under Soviet domination grew alarmingly long. More and more nations fell under the yoke of a new form of imperialism at the very time when the list of countries under Western colonialism was growing shorter.

Although we still have no cause for unguarded optimism, it is possible to point to a number of trends which are already threatening monolithic Communist domination in a number of countries.

Communist dogmatists are having to face the fact that the same political forces which propelled many African and Asian peoples into nationhood are operating in the countries under Communist rule. For the desire for self-determination and national independence is universal. It is even beginning to influence and divide Communist hierarchies. Only a few months ago Rumania's growing independence on economic questions was extended to certain political matters. Rumania suggested Soviet troops have been in Eastern Europe long enough.

I suspect that we have only begun to witness the changes which the forces of polycentrism will bring. For even a small amount of independence and internal liberalization tends to make people want more.

Another factor which is operating against the perpetuation of a Communist empire is the failure of Communist economic theories when they are actually put into practice. Yugoslavia has essentially abandoned collectivization of agriculture and has instituted a semi-market economy. The Polish regime has had to relax its policy of agricultural collectivization.

We must do all we can to help insure that these processes continue and become more widespread. For, by themselves, these changes are only a beginning. The peoples of Eastern Europe are still far from achieving true freedom and national independence. In some countries these liberalizing tendencies have not even begun.

Because America is committed to the ideas of political freedom and independence, we cannot remain indifferent to the fate of the captive nations. We must look with hope toward the day when it will no longer be possible to speak of "captive nations." We must have faith that this day will come. Great empires have inevitably crumbled because conquerors could not continue to enforce their will on diverse peoples. The Communist empire is no exception.

The Captive Nations, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the attention of this country, indeed of the entire world, is presently focused on the struggles in Asia. Some attention is also being paid to the crisis in the Western Alliance in Europe. But one area of contention in this age of international upheaval is given little notice. This area comprises what are properly called the captive nations.

The nations which disappeared as independent entities behind the Iron Curtain of Josef Stalin two decades ago are still held by brute force within the pattern of relationships which comprise the Soviet Communist empire established by the late dictator. The methods of repression of dissent—there is no question of anything stronger such as outright opposition—may now be more subtle than in the past, but they are still actively used. Students demonstrate against some aspects of the floundering regime in Prague and are hauled off to prison. Religion is still vigorously attacked in all these countries. Ties with the West are not as strongly built as is sometimes supposed. Witness the refusal to allow the Pope to attend celebrations of the Polish millennium held earlier this year.

The fate of those brave young patriots who defied the mechanized power of the Red army in Hungary is not yet fully known. But we can be certain that it was an unpleasant one, as the accounts of the mass deportations which followed the Soviet intervention would indicate. The tales of horror of the police state which existed with the sanction of the Soviet Union before the revolt in 1956 have been admirably recounted in the book by James Michener, "The Bridge at Andau."

There have been some changes in the economic management policies of some of the states fashioned in the Soviet image. However, other forms of what might be called liberalization have not appeared. The absolute monopoly of power is still held by the currently supreme cliques within the Communist oligarchies which have furnished all the leaders since the Russians conquered the East European states. The basic sources of power of these regimes is still that which helped to establish and cement their capture of power 20 years ago. These sources are the omnipresent domestic police apparatus and the less obvious, but never-forgotten might of the Red army.

Mr. Speaker, we should never let the dramatic news of current events in other parts of the world, and here at home, cloud our realization of what has happened to millions of human beings living under the yoke of Soviet imperialism and its nefarious agents. We must do our utmost to let the ordinary citizens of these horrid replicas of a dark age of despotism know that we do remember them, that we do not agree that their present condition is either morally acceptable or permanent.

The observance of Captive Nations Week here in this bastion of freedom is a correct and necessary event. We are the bulwark against the tide of aggression and tyranny which has flowed from the state of Lenin and Stalin and their successors. If we do not realize that the terrible results of their previous actions are still existent in the world today, then who will bother or dare to remember and call out against the evil?

Mr. Speaker, I wish to add here my personal wish that it will not be long in the future before the observance of this week is unnecessary. I want to extend to the unbowed patriots of the captive nations my deepest sympathy and my sincerest hopes that soon we may be able to celebrate with them the achievement of their national freedom and independence.

L.B.J.'s Tardy Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the article appearing in the Washington Post on Friday, July 15, written by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, particularly appealed to me because of the detailed accounting of what the Banking and Currency Committee of the House contemplated in the way of legislation to supply money to the home construction field. It appears that the administration is as delinquent in handling this matter as they are in handling the airlines strike. Their column follows:

L.B.J.'s TARDY ACTION

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Acting with his usual indirection, President Johnson telephoned Secretary of Treasury Henry H. (Joe) Fowler, soon after he arrived in Texas last week that the time had come to do something about the lack of mortgage money and the crippled housing industry.

Mr. Johnson himself wants to keep in the background.

Specifically, the President told his Treasury chief to light a fire under the House Banking Committee. For months that Committee, headed by the old Texas populist, Rep. WRIGHT PATMAN, has been trying to find some way to put more money into the mortgage market. The desperate lack of housing money is one result of the Federal Reserve Board's high-interest policy.

Immediately after the telephone call from the President (who is coming under increasing pressure from friends to do something about sky-high interest rates), Fowler, Under Secretary Joseph Barr and other top Treasury aides went into action. First they made a round-robin of telephone calls of their own to members of the Banking Committee, by then scattered far and wide over the July 4 holiday.

Fowler and Barr followed that up with personal visits to Capitol Hill this week, where they buttonholed the membership to ask for help.

But the problem of rising interest rates is not so easily solved, even with the President himself now, and belatedly, demanding action. For when the Fed last December decided to raise the discount rate (the rate paid by commercial banks for money borrowed from the Fed), that increase spread into every crack and cranny of the Nation's money markets. Bringing rates down on a selective basis is no easier than stitching together a broken cobweb.

What, then, does the Administration want Congress to do? The package that Fowler and Barr are now unfolding for Banking Committee members is tentative and modest.

To move savings back into the mortgage market and out of commercial banks, Fowler wants Congress to give the Fed new power to set a lower interest ceiling on relatively small savings deposits (under $100,000) placed with the banks. Banks are now paying as high as 5½ per cent on commercial deposits. If a 5-per cent ceiling were placed on the less-than-$100,000 deposits, investors would presumably put more of their money into savings and loan establishments, which in turn would use it to finance new housing.

But Fowler also proposes that the Home Loan Bank Board be given new power to establish maximum interest rates on investments in the savings and loan associations. Theoretically, then, what Fowler calls the "rapid escalation of interest rates" would cease with both the banks and the savings and loan outfits working under temporary interest rate ceilings.

Although savings and loan officials, and the housing industry, feel that this juggling of interest rates might add substantial sums to the mortgage market, particularly in money-tight California, no one can be sure. Other high-rate competition for money is fierce. Thus there is some support on the Committee for a more drastic step: empowering the Fed to buy up obligations of the Home Loan Bank Board, thus giving the Board new cash to put directly into the mortgage market.

Again, however, this panacea would precisely depend on the willingness of the tight-money Fed to take advantage of the new law. Inordinately worried about inflation, the Fed might simply refuse to buy the Board's obligations, unless ordered by Congress.

At stake here is far more than a mild depression in the vast housing industry. What is really involved is the reltaive powerlessness of the President to deal with the Nation's monetary distortions against the wishes of the wholly independent Federal Reserve Board. The action of the Fed last December started a monetary ripple that has now become a high wave, undermining the second largest industry in the Nation and menacing the entire economy.

Although Mr. Johnson is personally behind it, the new move comes perilously late in the face of clear signs months ago that action was needed. The President is now suffering from the lack of a clear, consistent economic policy combining both fiscal and monetary measures.

Letters From Vietnam From a Neighborhood Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. BATTIN
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Great Falls, Mont., Tribune, by Mary S. Carroll, told a graphic story of the heroic battle American boys are waging in Vietnam. The story was done from excerpts of letters from Rod Lots, a helicopter crew chief to his mother and father in Great Falls.

I have unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LETTERS FROM VIET NAM FROM A NEIGHBORHOOD BOY

(By Mary S. Carroll)

This is about a boy in our block, the 300 block of Fifth Avenue North in Great Falls. He's typical of thousands of boys in many blocks, in many towns across America. These excerpts from Roger Lots' letters to "Mom and Dad" aren't arranged chronologically; dates and places have been deleted for the most part. What they do show, we think, is a picture of life in Viet Nam today and the boys who bear the brunt of the battle there.

We neighbors watched Rod grow up: Marbles, cutting grass, shoveling snow. Then, when he was in his 'teens, we began seeing his photos with Great Falls High School teams—football, basketball and track—then he went to college at Bozeman—then to Viet Nam.

His parents, Ann and Bob Lots, and younger sister, Rosanne and brother, Bob, are courageous people.

Ann says, "My boy knows why he's in Viet Nam even if some of these people don't. Rod's letters make us realize that these Vietnamese are real people and the Viet Cong treat them cruelly. Our boys are involved a lot with people—helping them. Rod asked in a letter for some candy kisses, wrapped; not chocolate (it melts). He wanted to carry them in his pocket for the kids. He got the candy."

Rod's grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Roscoe Lots, also live in our block and watch anxiously for news of the 1st Cavalry.

Rod left the United States Aug. 17, 1965, for Viet Nam with a helicopter unit of the 1st Cavalry. In his first letter home from Viet Nam, he told of getting their base established, then:

"We lost a couple of guys last night, but they weren't in our outfit. It seems like the night is the only time they (the Viet Cong) fight.

"One night a couple of cooks got up to make coffee. They lit a fire and the guards opened up with an M-60 machine gun. Neither got hit but it sure scared hell out of them. Me, too, as the shells went right over my tent.

"There isn't really a lot I can tell you except this isn't a fun kind of war."

Excerpts from other letters follow:

"We are at a place called An Khie. It's about 48 miles from where we landed. There are jungled hills all around us. This was where the French sent 5,000 troops through and only 140 got out alive. It rains every day and night without fail. They just started shelling to the East tonight.

"The food is lousy. It wasn't so bad when we got C rations but now we get A and B rations which the cooks prepare and is it ever terrible! But it will suffice. Maybe I'll get skinny!"

"Right now I'm sitting under a tree on guard duty. We become officially operational tomorrow, and I sure hope things get better. This sleeping and eating on the ground is terrible but I guess there really isn't much a guy can do. There are two regiments of VC, one on each side of us, and we really have been giving them hell for the past couple of days.

"I'd tell you now but I can't and you'll read about it in the papers one of these days. Last night on guard duty a snake wrapped itself around a guy's head.

"Hasn't been much happening today except a couple of plane crashes and a few guys got shot up. I guess we're moving out for a few weeks as our unit is going up in the pass to open it up for a Korean division to come through."

"Someone threw a hand grenade in a bar downtown today, injuring a couple of GI's. I don't know what the guys were going in the bar as it was off limits. One of our guys got caught in a bar about a week ago. He got demoted and 14 days extra duty.

"Here is a picture of one end of our fixed wing aircraft runway. The hill is where they killed a few VC one night and found 20,000 rounds."

"Our guard was from 6 at night to 6 this morning. Today was the first time I had time, so I took a shower. It's only river water, heated and sprayed on."

"We killed one of the prettiest snakes the other day. It was a blackish-green with red about three inches down from its head and then yellow for three more inches; then white for another three. The rest was this blackish-green color. When it crawled it would raise itself about six inches off the ground and puff out like a cobra. They said it was a bamboo snake. They are related to the coral snakes we have back in the States.

They say if a person gets bitten by one they have less than an hour to live and that there is no cure; but we don't have many snakes around here so they really aren't any bother."

"Sure do wish I could be home for Christmas but I guess I'll have to wait till next year. Maybe this New Year will bring us closer to a peaceful understanding of the world. This sure is hell for those poor guys who have to be in the infantry.

"I took the time to write this letter on Christmas Eve to show that I was thinking about home even if I couldn't be there . . . We had the chance to send telegrams last night but I thought you might get shook up if they delivered one on Christmas day so I didn't send one. Merry Christmas and all that old rot, I guess, but it sure as hell isn't a very Merry Christmas being over here. I guess someone has to be here so I really don't feel too bad. Sure wish I could be home to do some fishing and some good hunting where they don't shoot back. It hasn't been very bad though."

"Now, please don't let what I'm telling you worry you, because it was the only thing that could be done by us, I hope? We had our wounded under a bunch of trees as the main force was fighting about 600 meters ahead. Then they fell back to where the wounded were and fought until they were so overwhelmed they had to retreat further back and leave the wounded as they couldn't get any choppers to pick them up.

"They killed about 200 VC and the next day when we came back we found they'd shot those wounded in the back of the head but we killed nearly all of the Viet Cong there, I hope. One man who was wounded went through the whole terrible affair. The shelling, napalm, and bombing—the Viet Cong didn't hurt him except for the first wound he got the first day. I guess someone sure didn't want him to die."

"I went on a flight yesterday afternoon and I got back about 8 o'clock. We went to the front and carried some farmers and a woman and a child out to the rear area. Some of the guys had killed a cow they found wandering around. They offered me some but I didn't think I wanted any. One pilot tried it and said it was pretty good."

"We are at Hollaway Air Strip near Pleiku which is about 80 miles from An Khie. They have an EM Club here and we can take showers with real running water. The only bad part is we have to sleep on the ground. The weather has been real nice. Don't let the papers scare you . . . they make everything sound so dramatic and it really isn't."

"One of the units that is part of the Third Brigade is out near the Cambodian border and has run into a division of VC. The VC had one company pinned down last night and they sent another in there this morning. We captured one VC last night and he said the VC division was hunting us and they were going to destroy us. He said they had had been living on bananas for the last four days and they were hungry!"

"Sure wish I had our tent and the stove here. It's going to be a long time before I go sleeping out in the woods when I get home!"

"We get paid in a couple of days but there isn't any place to spend any money. We have a tin box for a PX and all they have are razor blades, tooth paste and such. They did have cigarettes but they ran out. I don't care about that since I don't smoke."

"Two more of our ships got holes in them but no one was hit. One of the pilots, a major, tried to land in VC area—guess he was confused—but he sure got the hell out of there in a hurry. One unit came back from the field today so the flight will be normal again."

"We didn't lose a single man from our HHC but one security section got pinned down one day, but none of them were wounded. I saw where B52s dropped 250-pound bombs and the craters were about 40 feet deep and 100 feet in diameter. I sure am glad I wasn't in that area when they dropped those bombs."

"We flew up to Oai Nhon where we landed. It was a real beautiful sight to see all the mountains, rice fields and the ocean again. We were fired at but they went left and low. There were eight tracer rounds that we could see. We got a little too close to this one mountainside but we climbed in one hell of a hurry. There is a big strike on today. They will fly a lot of missions and we will have a lot of work to do for several days (repairing 'copters). One of our ships came in today with a hole in the pilot's door where a 50 cal. bullet went through but they have armored chairs to sit in and the chair deflected the bullet."

"I don't get to fly much but when I get the chance I go up. It's usually in the evenings when they have staff meetings up in the front area. They usually fly pretty high so don't worry, Mom, about my getting hit since you take greater chance walking across the street, than I do. Well, I had better close since those damned planes are coming in and I'll have to work all night."

Hard Times Knocking at Poverty's Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, because of the controversy aimed by critics from the left and the right at the proposals for extension of the Economic Opportunity Act, it behooves us to carefully assess the real record of the war on poverty.

As one might expect, problems have been encountered in getting the bold new program in operation. However, the problems are being identified and improvements are being made.

On close examination, some of the so-called problems turn out to be mere political smokescreens. For example, from some quarters there is a great cry about mismanagement. But less than one-half of 1 percent of all OEO funds have come under any questioning by auditing. Others have protested what they call a high cost of operation and claim that the funds are not reaching the poor. The fact is that less than 5½ percent of the OEO appropriation is going for administration of the program.

In the Southeast, 71 percent of the counties are now engaged in the OEO programs compared to 36 percent a year ago.

In Alabama, 30 counties have programs today where only 4 had programs last year.

In my district, where the citizens are concerned about improving conditions and breaking the patterns of poverty which are increasing welfare costs, every county has participated in the OEO program.

A thoughtful analysis of the OEO program was presented in an editorial in the Huntsville Times. I include it in my remarks at this point:

THE POVERTY WAR'S HARD TIMES

Hard times have come knocking at the door of the War on Poverty. Congress is soon to get its hands on measures to continue or revamp the budgets of the program. And because the program has become one of the biggest controversies of the current session, hazard is at hand.

The War on Poverty is beleaguered by its own mistakes. Sharp differences over policy have tarnished the image of a holy war. Off-year election partisanism is at work. Entrenched bureaucrats think they can run the War better than the Office of Economic Opportunity. The OEO, they insist, is a clumsy upstart.

The picture of success and failure varies from region to region.

In our own area—as is true in most places—Operation Headstart, the plan which introduces children to school, is clearly a success. Meantime, a planning session this week will map out a training project for the Negro community of Triana. The Madison County Community Action program, however, finds itself penniless for the moment—a bottleneck-at-a-higher-level situation which, as anyone will agree makes for especially discouraging confusion.

Nationally, some Republicans already are terming the Poverty War a shamble of scandals and abuses. A rag-tag consensus of Democrats talks of a bill that can give Congress more control over the program, set priorities on how funds will be expended and even earmark funds for poverty ghettos.

Both Democrats and Republicans seek to undercut the "government-by-the-poor" idea. The notion of a restructure of the American constituency that suggests creation of a caste system and a whole new layer of government has many politicians nervous.

There is a Democratic plan to counter charges of politics and wastefully high salaries. One proposal is a sort of "Hatch Act" that would ban anyone making a living from the Poverty War from taking a role in political campaigns (as federal employes are banned under Hatch Act provisions). The other proposal is a $12,500-a-year ceiling on Community Action program people.

Because controversy over the entire War on Poverty is going to mushroom in the coming weeks, The Times believes it behooves all of us to try to assess the pluses and minuses of the program—its record, its opportunities and its shortcomings.

In the Southeast, the proof of progress in the last year seems clear.

This region includes Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina and Tennessee. A year ago, only 185 (36 per cent) of the 516 counties in the region had organized OEO programs. Today, 364 (71 per cent) are actively engaged.

In Alabama a year ago, only four of the 67 counties had programs. Today, 30 counties (45 per cent) do have programs.

There have been many charges of mismanagement. But less than one-half of one per cent of all OEO funds have come under any questioning by auditing.

The charge of high salaries and high costs of operation arises in this region, as elsewhere. But less than 5½ per cent of OEO appropriation is going for administration of the program. That's the smallest percentage for any federal agency. And the staff of OEO is the second smallest of any federal program.

In the Southeast region, 110,000 pre-school youngsters have participated in Head Start. There are 59,000 underprivileged youths in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. There are 64,700 adults learning to read and write. There are 7,250 more adults who have come off the unemployed roles and into work-experience programs.

Every new program inevitably must undergo a shakedown. The War on Poverty, perhaps because the boldness of its concept, certainly is knowing a heavy amount of adjustment. Part of the bottleneck and mishaps is attributable to OEO administration at its several levels. Part of the woes stem from beaucratic jealousies and politics in an election year. But The Times believes it is important that any legislative revamping should not be permitted to toss the baby out with the bathwater.

Firm Policy Looking Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, broad support for President Johnson's outline of a firm policy in Vietnam is illustrated by an editorial in the Denver Post.

There have been so many repercussions from the bombing of North Vietnam's fuel dumps that it is difficult to avoid speculation that a turning point is near at hand, the Post says.

The newspaper finds optimistic reports about the fighting in Vietnam encouraging, although it urges caution.

Ultimately, it declares, a peace settlement acceptable to the United States and South Vietnamese interests may be possible. Firmness in that goal, as the President has firmly outlined it, is in the newspaper's opinion our best course of action at this time.

The editorial follows:

[From the Denver Post, July 7, 1966]

FIRM WAR POLICY LOOKING BETTER

There are so many repercussions to the bombing of fuel dumps in North Viet Nam—rumored and real—that it is difficult to avoid speculation that a turning point in Viet Nam is near at hand.

Top U.S. officials are on record with the new view. President Johnson, George W. Ball, undersecretary of state, and Vice President Humphrey all said this week that North Viet Nam no longer expects victory.

Meanwhile, a report from a French journalist in Hanoi says President Ho Chi Minh of North Viet Nam is thinking of negotiating with the United States in 1967 "if there is no new development" in the war's progress.

The brighter view of the Vietnamese war was evident before the bombing. The main reasons were the U.S. troop buildup and Prime Minister Ky's successful moves against his domestic foes in South Viet Nam.

But the reports of disenchantment in Hanoi appear to have accelerated since U.S. planes began attacking fuel storage areas around Hanoi and Haiphong June 28. Damage to North Viet Nam's capability to wage war in South Viet Nam has been heavy. Aerial surveys have confirmed this.

And it must be even more disheartening to Hanoi's strategists to find that President Johnson's conduct of the war continues to receive strong backing despite flare-ups of antiwar sentiment. Success of the bombing raids, in effect, is answering the President's critics.

At the same time that optimistic reports are coming in, we would urge caution. One reason is very obvious. Hanoi may be indulging in some semi-public agonizing with a definite goal in mind: getting more help from Russia and China.

We think, also, that Americans ought to be cautioned against thinking in terms of total victory. The war in Viet Nam remains limited.

If, for example, North Viet Nam and Viet Cong units were to find the going too tough in South Viet Nam they could temporarily pull across the border into Cambodia, which they are using as a staging area now. It is doubtful the American people are ready for an invasion of Cambodia; many Americans still have reservations about the Hanoi-Haiphong raids.

There is, additionally, the physical impossibility of crushing North Viet Nam short of nuclear attack or a full-scale occupation of the country—moves which would invite Red Chinese entry into the conflict.

The new optimism about the Asian war is encouraging, however. It may mean that the next Canadian peace mission to Hanoi will find a tangible sign that Ho Chi Minh is willing to talk about the possibility of negotiations. Ultimately, a peace settlement acceptable to American and South Vietnamese interests may be possible. Firmness in that goal—as President Johnson has firmly outlined it—is our best course of action at this time.

The Bombings—For and Against

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner herewith in the Appendix of the Record.

Mr. Hearst's editorial entitled "The Bombings—For and Against" is in my opinion well balanced and sound. I have been pleased by the understanding of the Vietnam problem which has been consistently portrayed in the newspaper editorials of Metropolitan Los Angeles newspapers and the weekly and daily newspapers in my congressional district in Los Angeles County:

THE BOMBINGS—"FOR" AND "AGAINST"

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr., Editor-In-Chief, The Hearst Newspapers)

On this July 4 weekend, commemorating the spirit of freedom that gave birth to our great country, we find the world around us—and some here at home—plunged into controversy over the path America is taking in the world today. This is not particularly unusual, even considering the sharpness of the debate in the past few days, so I shall keep this week's column brief—giving us all more time to enjoy the annual memory of our glorious Independence Day.

The recent commotion, of course, centered upon the American bombing of oil installations near the North Vietnamese cities of Hanoi and Haiphong. Personally, I fail to see what the excitement is all about. We have been attacking North Vietnamese military objectives by air for more than a year, to the accomplishment of various mutterings and grumblings—and applause and commendations—both at home and abroad. So why all the fuss about the extensions of these attacks to such obviously military targets as these oil depots?

However, let's look at the "for" and the "against" line-up on this issue.

Included in the "against" crowd are: Senators J. W. Fulbright and Wayne Morse (naturally), plus Senators Mike Mansfield and George Aiken, with Robert Kennedy expressing more doubt than total conviction. In addition there were the group of 16 House Democrats, UN Secretary-General U Thant and the so-called "Arab national press." Prime Minister Harold Wilson of Britain and the Vatican also voiced concern, although both have extended their efforts toward bringing the Communists to the conference table, only to be rejected with the same curtness as has greeted similar American efforts.

The uncompromisingly "for" crowd, on the other hand—led by President Johnson—includes a most emphatic Vice President Hubert Humphrey and U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, plus our armed services, former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman, former Vice President Richard Nixon, a great majority in both houses of Congress, and all our allies in the vast Pacific basin, including Japan and our Australian, New Zealand and South Korean battlefield partners. In this group I also most enthusiastically place myself, and the sympathies and support of The Hearst newspapers.

Comments voiced by Ambassador Goldberg were particularly incisive. He pointed out to the U.N. Security Council and to Secretary-General Thant that a cessation of the bombing to North Vietnam was certainly not the way to stop the war—thus flatly contradicting Mr. Thant's own position. He also took issue with the secretary-general's protest against the oil depot raids—made on the grounds that they were in "heavily-populated areas"—and emphasized that the greatest caution had been taken by the U.S. to strike at military targets only. He pointed out, moreover, that Vietcong guerrillas exercises no such caution in their terrorism and assassination tactics in South Vietnam. The sole way to peace, Ambassador Goldberg urged, was through negotiation.

The attack on the oil depots also produced a flood of firmly-encouraging British newspaper editorials. It appears that the gentlemen of the Fleet Street press, many of whom are Battle of Britain veterans, have longer memories than the labor party politicians who seem to have influenced Prime Minister Wilson during this episode. From their own wartime experience they know that the paralysis of an enemy's fuel system can be a decisive step toward ending and winning a war.

Major British press comment, in fact, was decidedly on the American side with regard to the bombing. The Times called the action "understandable" from a military point of view. The Daily Telegraph observed that military justification for the raids was clear . . . and that the greatest consideration was taken to avoid populated places. The giant Daily Express questioned what alternative President Johnson faced in view of the fact that North Vietnam supplies the arms which permit the Vietcong to maintain its campaign in South Vietnam. The Daily Mail observed: "Unless we want Chinese Communist influence to flood through Southeast Asia—and it is always possible that its dangers have been over-estimated—the stand in Vietnam must be made. The war has to be fought and won."

The entire clamor directed against the oil depot bombings, in short, was based on the fact that the attacks were the closest yet to the civilian populations of Hanoi and Haiphong. But the fact remains that these targets were still considerably removed from the civilian population centers, by distances measured in miles. Moreover, neither President Johnson nor the military men on the scene in Vietnam have the slightest intention or desire to attack civilians. We only wish that similar sentiments were shared by those who indiscriminately throw hand grenades into civilian areas in South Vietnam, including crowded theaters and similar "targets." In our case, too, the pilots involved in the raids were most carefully briefed on the necessity of avoiding civilian areas.

But the most effective way of ending casualties of any kind in this grim business is to stop fighting and start talking. The U.S. is ready to do this at any time, while the Communists have brutally rejected any suggestion of negotiations to bring about peace.

Our commitment in Vietnam can survive this latest furor. Our policy will, in President Johnson's words, "continue to impose a growing burden and a high price on those who will wage war against the freedom of others." Which is precisely what that other addition to the "for" list—the great majority of the American people—feels, too.

Resource Development Action in Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIM LEE CARTER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much encouraged by the determined efforts of rural people in the Appalachian area of Kentucky to improve their economic base by developing their land and water resources. They are moving forward in working out resource problems that have been a bottleneck to progress.

I have been following with interest the Mill Creek small watershed project in Monroe County, Ky., my home county in the congressional district I represent. It is a good example of local action that is being taken with State and Federal help. It is an indication of how tools of the Appalachian Regional Development Act are being put to work in combination with the small watershed program.

The project work plan has been completed and is under agency review before being presented to congressional committees for approval. The project area is one where there is urgent need to increase family income, which, of course, affects the economy of the entire county. Farmland, roads, and bridges are beset annually by damaging floods. This flooding has an adverse effect not only on land use, but on the economy of the watershed. Cropland, grassland, and forestland need conservation practices if they are to contribute to economic stability and halt erosion. However, many of the people involved have not been able financially to carry out this work.

The Mill Creek project was approved for help under section 203 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. As a result, farmers have already started to apply needed conservation practices. It is significant, I think, that the majority of the people who are receiving this help have not been reached before by other programs. This is a good sign. It is an indication that the purposes of the Appalachian Act are being fulfilled.

The land treatment is a basic element of the watershed project itself. Plans call for all feasible measures to solve soil and water problems and, in addition, to enhance the overall economy of the watershed community, especially low-income farms.

The city of Tompkinsville will have a new source of water supply from a planned 72-acre multipurpose reservoir at which public recreation facilities are also to be developed. Growth and development of Tompkinsville presently is seriously hampered by lack of adequate quality water. The recreation area is expected to serve over 18,000 people annually. This recreation area will complement a smaller development at the adjacent Old Mulkey House State Park, a historic shrine dating back to the days of Daniel Boone.

I think these people are doing a tremendous job and they have my support, as do other similar small watershed projects in the area. In many Appalachian communities, the sound development of natural resources is the main hope if sustained benefits are to be realized. Projects such as Mill Creek serve to carry out the purposes of the tools we have given rural people to stimulate economic activity.

Address of Hon. John E. Fogarty, Second Congressional District, Rhode Island, Before the American Association of School Librarians' Convention, New York Hilton, July 11, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, RHODE ISLAND, BEFORE THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL LIBRARIANS' CONVENTION, NEW YORK HILTON, JULY 11, 1966

School libraries are caught in the middle of a whirlwind. This whirlwind will toss American education into the uncharted future of all Western civilization.

Never before in recorded history have a people turned so decisively to formal education as the basis for reaching their economic, political, and social goals. The industrial revolution depended on the human body, not the human mind. The electronic and the nuclear revolution will increasingly depend on the power and flexibility of highly trained intelligence.

As school librarians, you must not try to take shelter from this educational whirlwin. Such an act would invite disaster. Instead, face the wind at its strongest point, the electronic processing of intelligence and its immediate communication to the point of need.

I predict that it will become increasingly difficult to tell a librarian from a teacher. Any kind of librarian at any level, from all kinds of teachers at all levels. Education involves learning. Learning is something that each of us does for himself. Teachers, colleagues, librarians, or machines can only assist in making such learning as efficient and productive as possible.

Since learning is exclusively an individual process, more and more educational emphasis is being placed on individual instruction. New educational technology will soon make it possible to bring the best teacher, the best book, the best educational experience to each student.

We can realistically expect to achieve in the forseeable future, the electronic equivalent of Mark Hopkins on one end of the log and each of us—all students everywhere—on the other.

Individualized instruction is, in a sense, the fundamental concept behind libraries. "The right book for the right reader at the right time" still sums up the best basis for developing library services. As this concept pervades educational theory, practice, the means, but not goals, will change and develop. It is the size of the job to be done and its urgency, that demands innovation, flexibility, and prompt action. We must shorten or eliminate the lag that has existed between the best library practices anywhere and all other libraries everywhere.

I have watched with interest the Knapp School Libraries project as an indicator of things to come. Oak Park, for example, has taken advantage of both the Knapp Project and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for the electronic retrieval of concept films in the library. This effort will involve teachers, librarians, administrators, and private industry in the effort to improve learning. The library plans to provide several hundred carrels so that students may individually dial their selection at a time convenient to them.

In fact, a child at home in the evening will be able to dial the core and the required concept film would be received over his standard TV set. This kind of development which, when fully operational, should be immediately exploited by other schools to meet their particular need. I am not advocating faddism here. I do not suggest that we bow with every breeze in the whirlwind. But I do submit that we must identify what techniques are effective and we must move swiftly to equalize their impact on all students.

A vehicle for such educational improvement may be found in the network of regional educational laboratories being established by the U.S. Office of Education. Their purpose is to assist local school districts in assessing their own educational programs and practices, developing or identifying new methods for their improvement, and actually implementing worthwhile innovations. Many of these laboratories will be investigating the potential of projects like Oak Park's in solving their educational problems. Whenever they are convinced that the equipment does indeed make a significant contribution to the educational function commensurate with its cost, they will develop demonstration projects to encourage local school districts to follow their lead wherever similar educational problems exist. The laboratories will have the technical competence to determine whether the software has been adequately evaluated and will recommend to the local districts those systems which have been proven effective.

This effort of the laboratories is an extension of the research which has been carried on by the Office of Education for a number of years, but the laboratories take the planning and implementation of the research and development activity out to the schools themselves and thus give the whole effort a practical orientation which will help to speed up and give direction to the entire educational improvement effort. The Federal Government will continue to carry on a wide range of research and development activities, ranging from basic studies in cognitive psychology, through development and evaluation of educational techniques, to the disemmination programs necessary to acquaint local districts with these efforts.

It is significant to note that library-related projects are being conceived and funded under every Title of ESEA. Libraries are not being confined merely to the acquisition of materials under Title II.

The technological advances which I have mentioned can make their greatest contribution to educational improvements if we maintain a close working relationship between the "hardware" and the "software" people. It is clear from the many weddings of publishers and electronics firms that industry is becoming increasingly aware of this need. But this is not enough. The partnership must be extended also to all those in industry who depend upon the human resource development of the educational enterprise and to all those in education including librarians who must somehow get a vision of the future for which our youth are being prepared.

I am glad to report that Warwick, Rhode Island has one of the first projects approved under Title III of ESEA. This operational project was designed to be a demonstration of an exemplary library established in an elementary school. The area served has a high concentration of children from low-income families. By next year, the facility will be used to train librarians, teachers and school administrators from all over the State on an inservice basis.

These Title III projects are becoming the pacesetters in innovation. The term PACE refers to "Projects to Advance Creativity in Education". Another example comes from Asheville, North Carolina. Their operational project calls for the establishment of an audio-visual and library center. This center is delivering instructional materials to 33 schools in an area covering 600 square miles. Services include: repairing and circulating educational films; processing library books and materials; centralizing ordering and billing; and providing facilities for inservice education of teachers and librarians. This project directly serves an estimated 21,000 students, librarians, and teachers.

These developments have enormous implications for the training and competencies of school librarians. You will be called upon to work closely with teachers in arranging schedules and facilities to aid students in individual projects. New programs will call for a new approach by school librarians in selecting and utilizing library resources. Librarians will be aiding children in learning to analyze and seek solutions to the many local, contemporary problems.

Just as the public library has a responsibility to the general public for stocking the current materials on community problems, the school library also holds a responsibility for keeping students well informed on local problems. Students will be seeking answers to the problems of mental health, water pollution, and conservation as they are learning to become active, interested citizens. School librarians should aid children in searching through books and materials for the many conflicting points of view. School librarians will, therefore, be asked to perform the job of a good public relations and information officer. They will prepare picture exhibits, lecture series and informational pamphlets to relate the modern world to academic studies. The school library will become the first place to which a child turns naturally for information, and the school librarian should be far ahead of him in knowing what the young student needs.

You, as an organization of school libarians, realize what a tremendous task it will be to reorganize and reshape many of our school libraries to meet such demands. The concept of the library as a center for individual and group research on historical and contemporary problems, will naturally cause the physical facilities of the school library to change. It will contain projectors, computers, tape recorders and consoles to enable the students to utilize library resources to maximum individual advantage. Computers will house both accurate, cross-referenced indexes for information retrieval and factual informational data. Students will use tape recorders to record oral presentations and to listen to research tapes.

The school library administered in this context has created a demand for a new kind of school librarian. Institutions providing professional education for school librarians, and others concerned with inservice programs are giving increased attention to the content of the school librarian's education. Many library schools now offer courses in the school library administered as an instructional materials center. Institutes and workshops teach librarians new skills and help them become acquainted with new materials and equipment. In addition to library school improvements, there must be more school librarians. Present standards for staffing school libraries are too low for today's instructional programs. More young people should be encouraged to become school librarians; classroom teachers and other qualified adults should be recruited to librarianship. Librarians now in service should be used more effectively by providing supporting personnel.

Routine tasks should be delegated to library clerks who can be employed at lower salaries. Other jobs may be performed by librarian aides or technicians. People like these can provide many services under the supervision of professional school librarians, thus freeing them for crucial curriculum related activities. Jobs not requiring extensive professional knowledge and judgment can be performed at lower cost and more efficiently by personnel with a training at a lesser level. In a world of specialists it is obvious that using school librarians as clerks or technicians is poor economy. It is also poor educational practice. In today's changing school libraries, the school librarians should provide sound professional library service to education.

The movement of the school library from a book-centered agency on the fringes of the educational program to one that supplies the broadest range of instructional materials has radically altered its role in the school. It has moved front and center, and now must become a dynamic new force in the whole picture of elementary and secondary education.

In assessing the role of the school library in the entire educational community, we must not overlook the vast potential of Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act of 1966. This Title, which provides funds for interlibrary cooperation, will include school libraries in library networks designed to provide maximum access to materials needed by all library users. This provision of LSCA will directly supplement both ESEA and the Higher Education Act to bring focus and direction to our library efforts.

In fiscal year 1967, more than $1¼ billion will be available in Federal grants from the U.S. Office of Education alone to improve libraries of all kinds. An investment on this scale is a great and exciting challenge to all of us interested in good libraries. Now is the time for all of us to give our best efforts toward an educational system that will be equal to our times. We in the Congress have done our part to help assure good schools and good libraries. It is now up to you and your colleagues across the Nation to put these programs to work in a way that will do the job. Godspeed and good luck!

Energy and Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the excellent address entitled "Energy and Transportation," which was given to the business and logistics forum at Stanford University, Friday, July 8, 1966:

ENERGY AND TRANSPORTATION

(An address by W. G. Blewett, vice president, Peabody Coal Co., given to the business and logistics forum, Stanford University, Friday, July 8, 1966)

Professor Ruppenthal, whether he knows it or not, paid me quite a compliment when he suggested that I talk with you on the subject of "Elecircicity and Logistics," allotting me thirty minutes for the talk. First of all, I want to say that I would like to refer to my paper as simply "Energy and Transportation." But with regard to the thirty minutes, gentlemen, I am not embarrassed to say that I could not cover the subject in thirty minutes, thirty days, or within any given length of time. As I began preparing for this talk, I quickly came to the realization that there isn't anyone in the United States, or for that matter in the enire world, who could cover the subject completely. The reason is simple. The subject is so complex, so involved, and so massive that while there are people who are expert in special areas, no one could possibly be expert in all areas. So I hope you will understand that all I will try to do here is to apply a broad brush. After that, I hope you will ask questions. I will answer those that I can, and promise to refer the others to authorities and experts who I am sure will respond to your requests.

Let me start with a few statistics to illustrate the imporance of energy, both to mankind in general and in the consideration of transportation problems in particular.

It is well known that countries with high standards of living are those countries which have the highest per capita consumption of mechanical energy. The United States leads the world in per capita consumption of energy. In fact the per capita consumption in the United States is more than five times as great as the world average.

To put it another way, the world fuel requirements at the present time are slightly over five billion tons per year in terms of coal equivalent. And it may interest you to know about one-half of that total is supplied by coal, in spite of the inroads of oil and gas. The United States consumes over one-third of the world total, or nearly two billion tons per year in terms of coal equivalent. Of the amount consumed in the United States, about one-fourth, or 500 million tons, is produced in the form of coal. The rest, of course, is produced in the form of oil, gas, and hydroelectric power.

Consumption of energy requires the transportation of energy, and this occurs in many ways. Transportation of coal by rail or water; transportation of oil and gas by rail, water and pipeline; and transportation of electricity by extra-high-voltage transmission—a relatively new entry in the field. As atomic power takes its place in the energy field—and I will be saying more about that later—it will not involve much transportation, since atomic fuel has very little bulk.

Let me illustrate the importance of energy to transportation, and the importance of transportation to energy. About one-third of the world's fuel needs are supplied by oil, and only one-half of this oil is carried across the seas. Nevertheless, sea-going oil accounts for more than one-half of all sea-going transport. To put it another way, transporting one-sixth of the world's fuel across the oceans is a bigger job than transporting all other goods combined.

Again, in the United States, the tonnage of coal hauled by the railroads accounts for more than one-fourth of the tonnage of all commodities hauled by the railroads. It is easy to see that energy is important in the transportation figure.

The converse is just as true: transportation is extremely important in the energy picture. Coal, oil and gas are bulk commodities, and the cost of transporting them is far more important to the consumer than is the case with respect to most commodities. Oil and gas had a tremendous advantage over coal in this respect, because the cost of transporting a liquid is lower than the cost of transporting a solid—at least, it was, until the waterways became available on an increasing scale. Doubling the cost of transporting a new automobile might increase the cost of the auto to the consumer by 3 or 4 percent; doubling the cost of transporting coal to the consumer could easily increase the delivered cost by one-third.

The present production and transportation of energy throughout the world constitutes a vast undertaking, as I have already outlined. But, what about the future?

The future presents requirements so great that they are difficult for the mind to grasp. The world fuel requirements today, of 5 billion tons of coal equivalent, are expected to be 10 billion tons by the year 1980 and 20 billion tons by the year 2000. How will that market be supplied? It will need every contribution possible, from every source of energy and by every means of transportation.

In the United States the growth of energy requirements projected by the experts is as impressive as it is for the rest of the world. Even more so, in the case of the electricity market which constitutes coal's primary interest. It is commonly known that electricity requirements in the United States are doubling every 10 years. The magnitude of such growth is difficult to grasp, but the president of Edison Electric Institutes put it into perspective when he said, at a meeting in San Francisco in June: "This means that we have less than 35 years to build the equivalent of seven additional power systems the energy size of all that is now serving the American people."

That staggers the imagination. Seven more power systems, each as large as the existing system, in the next 35 years. You can understand why we are optimistic about the future of the coal industry. Even if atomic power could supply two or three of these additional systems, we are going to need a fantastic increase in coal production. At the same time, there must be increased facilities for transporting the energy that will be required, and this, of course, poses development problems in transportation.

On the subject of atomic power, let me point out that a great deal of misinformation has been distributed on this glamorous new source of energy. Many people labor under the mistaken belief that atomic power will supply most, or all, of the energy of the future. It just isn't possible.

In the first place, the assured reserves of low-cost uranium in the entire free world, if used in reactors of the type now under construction, can supply the amount of power which could be produced by about one per cent of the reserves of U.S. coal. Undoubtedly, more will be found. But who knows how much?

The so-called "breeder" reactor which will be developed some day will not solve the problem of shortage of low-cost uranium. First, it is predicted that breeders will double the supply of burnable material over a period of 15 to 25 years, but electricity needs double every 10 years. In such circumstances, breeders will be able to take care of a fraction of the increasing requirements. In addition, breeders, like the reactors of today, have problems of their own. Even when the difficult technical problems in their operation are worked out, mankind will be faced with the necessity of disposing of vast quantities of deadly material in a manner which will keep it out of the biosphere for hundreds and hundreds of years. In spite of this, the development of breeder reactors is a long-range must because, eventually, mankind will run out of low-cost fossil fuels and will have to use the breeder reactors to produce power from the very costly uranium which can be obtained in quantity from extremely low-grade ores.

I will leave the subject of atomic power with a quotation from Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, AEC Chairman, who said just last month: "Our real concern will never be 'Is there a great enough market for our energy resources?' but rather 'Are our energy resources sufficient to meet the growing demands of the market?'"

Competition, it gots without saying, benefits the consumer—that is, the general public. That is just as true in the field of transportation as it is in any other field, including the production of energy. Let me, then, turn to past and future competition in transportation, particularly as it applies to low-cost, bulk commodities such as fuels.

Many years ago the railroads had a near-monopoly on the transportation of coal and everything else. You can imagine the results of this lack of competition. In 1932 the cost of hauling coal by rail, for instance, constituted about 64 per cent of the delivered cost of coal.

Competition for transportation of coal and for coal's power has developed the waterways, the possibility of coal pipelines, and the transmission of power by extra-high-voltage transmission. What has been the result? In 1961, the cost of hauling coal by rail averaged only about 40 per cent of the delivered cost of the coal. That is quite an improvement, compared to 64 per cent.

The improvement has been even more spectacular in the area of utility coal, and the development of our waterways deserves much of the credit. In recent years, the size of electric power plants—the biggest consumers of coal—has increased spectacularly, resulting in a single delivery point for large quantities of coal. Coal producers who were fortunate enough to have access to waterways were able to schedule long-term, large-quantity shipments on a regular basis, drastically reducing the cost of transportation. This, in turn, forced the railroads to develop the unit train concept, where continuous use of equipment is made possible for transporting coal from a single point of loading to a single large consumer. These developments reduced the cost of transportation, and of course the consumer (the public) benefits from reduced prices.

As a direct consequence of the competition in transportation, consumers in California will soon be served with low-cost electricity generated by the burning of coal many hundreds of miles away. Long-distance transmission lines are making it possible for this area to receive the benefits of alternate energy sources.

Improvement of transportation was historically the first objective in the Federal program to develop the Nation's waterways. Improvement of the waterways to stimulate agriculture, commerce and industry was among the earliest works of internal improvement undertaken by the National Government. This purpose alone has justified the program, as illustrated by the Ohio River Valley. Since 1950, on the banks of the main stream of the Ohio and its navigable tributaries, some 22 billion dollars have been invested in new and expanded plant facilities. This fantastic growth, with improved job opportunities, lower cost to the public, and an expanded tax base, could not have occurred without the facilities for improvement of the waterways. And, once again, do not let us forget that the waterways belong to the public of the United States.

Today, however, it is recognized that improvement of transportation is far from being the only benefit arising out of waterway development. Flood control, low-flow augmentation, and stabilized water supply, as well as recreational facilities and other social benefits, are interrelated to the improvement of our waterways. In this vital respect, the waterway improvement is unique among transportation media. Improvements to highways, air ways and railways perform only a transportation function; navigation improvements invariably serve other water resource objectives.

There are people who express concern over the impact of waterway improvements on the railroads. This anxiety lacks foundation. Where waterways have been developed, the resulting growth of the local economy has almost invariably resulted in increased railway traffic. Once again, the problem for the future is not lack of traffic, but lack of capacity to transport.

Our country has now entered upon an era of growth, accompanied by rising demands for transportation service, on a scale without precedent in our history. The Bureau of the Census projects a U.S. population for the year 1977 of 232 million; for the year 1990, of 300 million; and for the year 2000 (only 34 years away), of 350 million. That is almost twice the population of 1960. Literally, this country is in the process of doubling in size within a single generation.

Twice as many people will not require a mere doubling of transportation capacity, but more than doubling. With rising standards of wages and income, the volume of production per person is steadily increasing. The Gross National Product in 1966 will be near $700 billion. According to the forecasts of the National Planning Association, the GNP will be over $2,000 billion by the year 2000, that is, nearly triple. It therefore appears quite likely that by the year 2000 the American transportation system is going to have to carry over three times the present traffic volume. And we are told that the transportation industry at the present time is contributing approximately $130 billion to the Gross National Product.

The biggest load the railroads have ever carried so far was about 745 billion ton-miles under the forced-draft operation of World War II. By 1976, the Nation will be demanding of the railroads over one trillion ton-miles of freight. In view of the huge economic growth lying ahead, the railroads will be under severe strain to handle their present share, and I do mean present share, of the total necessary. Each mode of transportation will have to be enlarged and extended to provide that type of freight service for which it is best adapted.

Given the proper circumstances, water transportation is ideal for hauling fuel, particularly coal and other non-perishable bulk. The "proper circumstances" include, primarily, a large source of coal on or near the water plus a single very large consumer on or near the water. The advantage for water transportation is not confined to the cost of hauling. In addition, there is the advantage of equipping a modern coal mine with expensive and efficient machinery, secure in the knowledge that round-the-clock operation can be relied on. In a land-locked operation, round-the-clock operation can be prevented by shortage of transportation whenever unusual demands are made on the rail system.

Round-the-clock operation is extremely important in the use of expensive machinery. As you know, private enterprise generally considers from 12 to 15 per cent a year as an appropriate capital carrying charge to cover depreciation, interest, amortization, taxes and a reasonable profit. If this capital carrying charge can be spread over 100 per cent operation, the charge per unit of production is only half as great as it would be if it had to be spread over 50 per cent operation. In the case of coal, the capital carrying charge is a significant part of the mine-mouth cost.

The importance of the waterways in the coal transportation picture can be illustrated by the fact that about 100 million tons of coal per year is transported on the waterways, out of a total production of just over 500 million tons.

Let me quote again from the remarks of Dr. Seaborg, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in an commencement address at San Diego State College on June 10 of this year:

"For about 6,000 years of recorded history the prime source of man's energy was that which he could generate by his own muscle power. In many areas of the world—perhaps as much as two-thirds—a large part of the productive power is still this same muscle power. In our own technological society, however, human labor provides only a few tenthousandths of one percent of the work performed in all our industry. The rest is done by the more than 10 trillion mechanical-electrical horsepower hours used by industry each year. This figure, of course, rises every year. In addition to this mechanical energy used by industry, we use an even larger amount of energy for process and space heating and for transportation. In the United States, with only 6% of the world's population, we use about 35% of the world's energy output.

"With a world of six billion people striving for a standard of living similar to what most people in the U.S. and Western Europe enjoy today, and this will be rising too in the future, think of the energy demands which would have to be met. And future demands will arise out of problems we are only beginning to face today."

Gentlemen, the supplies of coal are in the ground in sufficient quantity to meet the growing demands of the future for centuries to come. Mining these increased amounts of coal will present a challenge, but it will be done. Mining it, however, is only part of the job. The energy has to be transported to the consumer. Some will be transported in the form of electricity by extra-high-voltage transmission lines. Some will be transported in coal-slurry pipelines. Some will be converted to synthetic liquids and gas and will be transported by pipeline. Nevertheless, a tremendous quantity will have to be transported by the railways and the waterways. The main problem with respect to transportation is not, where will the traffic come from? Rather, the serious question facing the transportation industry is, how can we handle all the traffic required?

Standpoint—Raymond M. Hilliard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the people of Cook County, Ill., have suffered a deep loss in the recent death of Mr. Raymond M. Hilliard, the outstanding administrator and director of public aid in Cook County. Few men have done as much for their fellow human beings as did Ray Hilliard during his lifetime.

I introduce for the Record a commentary on Ray Hilliard's life which was broadcast over WBBM–TV in Chicago:

Standpoint—Raymond M. Hilliard

(Presented by Edward R. Kenefick, vice president and general manager of WBBM–TV, Thursday, July 7, 1966)

Chicago has had its share of sad and difficult moments. One of those moments was saying farewell today to Raymond M. Hilliard.

His untimely death Monday at the age of 58 leaves Chicago with a special kind of emptiness because Raymond Hilliard was a unique man.

The fact that his gentle heart finally failed him is in some ways understandable, for his heart was in everything he did . . . and he did far more than most of us.

We seldom use the word superb, but we use it now because Raymond Hilliard was a superb human being. He gave hope and he gave help to thousands of hopeless and helpless people on our welfare rolls.

But more, he battled every day of his life to preserve their basic dignity . . . and there is no higher endeavor than that.

Those who worked for, and with, Mr. Hilliard have lost more than a superb administrator. They, and all of Chicago, have lost the very symbol of social compassion. The name of Raymond Hilliard and the word "welfare" have come to mean the same.

Perhaps it is only a footnote now, but it should be noted that Raymond Hilliard, more than any other person, created the pattern for erasing dependency . . . the same pattern from which the nation's War on Poverty was fashioned.

But he had this word of caution for Chicago's poverty planners: "Do not make this a burocrat operation . . . you can't see the faces of the poor through red tape."

He, himself, was a specialist, in rebuilding broken lives, but never, not for one minute, did he forget that the poor were people—hungry, frightened, lonely people in despair.

Mr. Hilliard was almost everything we admire in a man, but the things we admired most were his constant integrity, his heartfelt respect for the poor and the gentle way in which he served as their shepherd.

We offer sympathy to his family as we at WBBM–TV respectfully join the thousands who have benefitted from Raymond Hilliard's presence.

Major Setbacks in the War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the conduct of the Office of Economic Opportunity in meeting its purposes increasingly commands our attention and scrutiny.

There exist great needs in the fields designated as action areas for OEO; however, it has become more and more evident that bureaucracy and politics are dangerously stifling any attempts at concrete and useful advances.

A recent editorial in the Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel suggests that Congress should review the use of antipoverty funds, and we all know that an attempt to do this has been made. I, therefore, join my colleagues in requesting that the report of the ad hoc subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, that was authorized to study this program, be presented to the Congress before additional funds are appropriated.

Atrocity in the War on Poverty

Two professional employes of the Letcher County (Ky.) Economic Opportunity Committee have been fired, clearly in reprisal for making affidavits in which they charged mismanagement and misconduct in the administration of that county's War on Poverty.

The affidavits were first revealed in a series of articles entitled "Politics in Poverty" which ran in The News-Sentinel and other Scripps-Howard Newspapers last week. The series reported the existence of the affidavits, along with charges that the War on Poverty in Letcher County was marked by political abuse, nepotism and mismanagement. Since the articles appeared, the two Letcher County employes who made the sworn charges have been sacked, and Federal officials are busily scouring the county in an attempt to identify jobless men who complained that they were subject to political pressure as the price of continued enrollment in War on Poverty programs.

Beyond voicing a somewhat frail hope that a proposed multi-county reorganization would work needed reforms in Letcher County, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been remarkably silent. OEO insists it "has no mandate from Congress" to dictate reforms in local poverty councils, although it does concede it can compel changes simply by cutting off Federal funds it believes are being maladministered at the local level.

Congress itself, of course, has the ultimate mandate to see that Federal War on Poverty funds are dispensed in a wise and evenhanded manner, and not by political whim. If OEO continues to shirk its duty with respect to Letcher County, then it is possible Congress may want to exercise its mandate.

Gen. Drazha Mihailovich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday night, July 16, in the city of Indianapolis, Ind., I was highly honored by the Indiana Committee for Captive Nations and their distinguished president Mr. Ivan M. Jakovljevich. During the presentation of this unique award, Mr. Jakovljevich who fled the tyranny of Communist Yugoslavia, made a fine report concerning the great Serbian patriot, Gen. Drazha Mihailovich.

I feel that this report will be of great interest to Members of the Congress and include it in the Record. I present it in the exact form as it was given by Mr. Jakovljevich at this award ceremony:

Gen. Drazha Mihailovich

Not recognizing the capitulation of Yugoslav Army, with a certain number of officers, in that time Colonel Mihailovich went to Ravna Gora, a locality in Serbia (Yugoslavia), where he organized the First Guerrilla War against German occupation forces. Col. Mihailovich fought as leader of Serbian Chetniks: communism, nasism, fascism and all kind of the totalitarianism during the Second World War.

There the entire Serbian population of 10 millions greeted Col. Mihailovich spontaneously and volunteered to sacrificingly serve under him for the salvation and honor of Serbia. The other part of Yugoslavia, Croatia got its independence from Germans and enjoyed as the Independent State of Croatia.

General Mihailovich with his Serbian people contributed immensely to help the Allied victory in Africa by sabotaging the vital Axis lines Belgrade-Nis-Salonica. So, in the Second World War, General Mihailovich was the first guerrilla leader in Europe—his army consisting of Serbian Chetniks.

General Mihailovich rescued and delivered to Allied forces more than 600 American aviators who parachuted into occupied territory of Yugoslavia. At that time the free West glorified Mihailovich and pronounced him as the most glorious Army leader. His favors to Allied causes were most enthusiastically recognized by generals: Eisenhower, Sir Allan Cunningham, Marshall Tedder and De Gaulle.

Mihailovich was promoted to General and appointed as Chief of Staff of Supreme Command and then as Secretary of Army and Navy to be directly under command of Allied Forces in the Middle East. He was decorated with many war decorations.

But one day, the Allies "lost their soul" and betrayed their most faithful allies—Draza Mihailovich and his Serbian people—brought to the Serbian people Communist tyrants, the Allies handed to Communists the entire Yugoslavia and helped Communists to shackle the Serbian population who sacrified everything for Allies but received as help from them in their days of agony: the Communist hell. Arguments: wartime conferences of Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin in Teheran 1943, Yalta 1945, and Potsdam 1945.

During the Second World War, General Mihailovich led the fight for honorable freedom of all people faithfully cooperating with Allies who betrayed him to the communists who barbarically assassinated General Mihailovich July 17, 1946 somewhere in Serbia. His grave is unknown.

General Mihailovich became a symbol of those enslaved and oppressed, Serbian people vow, never to deviate from Mihailovich path but to continue his fight until victory of Serbian people over injustice has been won.

The American Serbs both as an ethnic group and as individuals, have been most constructive throughout their long stay in The United States for nearly one hundred years. Their contributions to America have been, in proportion to their number, quite noticeable, even without mentioning the two great scientific giants of this century: Nikola Tesla and Prof. Michael Pupin.

But one of their most cherished heritage that the American Serbs have brought to this continent is their most profound love for liberty and their readiness to fight for it and if necessary to die for it. This they have demonstrated in the First World War by sending from The United States over 20,000 volunteers—half of their number then in America—to fight against Austro-Germans.

The whole past life of the Serbian nation has been dedicated to liberty. This, together with Christian teaching of St. Sava has been and is now the basis of their national existence.

Tito's godless and barbarical regime has come in conflict with these fundamental traits of Serbian life. Today the Serbian people is the main backbone against communist totalitarian regime. Tito killed hundreds of Serbian Orthodox priest, even bishops, he imprisoned another Serbian Milovan Djilas, he ousted recently five of his generals Serbian by origin, and we just heard that the last Serbian, Rankovich with all his staff of Serbians have been ousted.

Lippmann and the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly fine editors of a great newspaper is Mr. Stan Evans of the Indianapolis News. This distinguished author and newsman presents a viewpoint that is not always popular in our Nation, but at the same time insists that other viewpoints must be heard, even in the paper which he serves as editor. I submit the following article for printing in the RECORD. Please note that Mr. Evans refers to Mr. Lippmann, whose column appears in the Indianapolis News. I think the article is refreshing and an intelligent summary of the liberal press and its leading author.

The article follows:

LIPPMANN AND THE PRESIDENT

(By Stan Evans)

Walter Lippmann, whose column of Liberal commentary appears on the opposite editorial page of The News, has been on many sides of many questions during his more than half-century of journalistic advocacy.

As readers of Lippmann's recent dispatches are no doubt well aware, he is consistent on one theme—that of retreating before the initiatives of international Communism, of achieving "detente" with the Bolsheviks, of bending before the advancing tide of Marxist revolution.

On just about everything else, however, it is possible to find Lippmann changing positions almost overnight without a quaver in the sonorous tone of mandarin authority in which he wraps his prose.

Nowadays, for example, Lippmann is a strenuous advocate of centralized economic planning by government. Yet back in the '30s he authored a volume called "The Good Society" which took just the opposi stance, arguing the virtues of free market competition and the need to minimize government intervention in the economy. Twenty years before that, in yet another switch, he had served as president of the Socialist Club at Harvard University.

What is perhaps the most astonishing of Lippmann's reversals, however, is of more recent vintage. Back in 1955 Lippmann brought out a celebrated book called "The Public Philosophy" in which he argued that the executive branch of government had "lost both its material and ethereal powers" to the legislature, popular opinion, and "the misrule of the people."

What was needed, Lippmann said, was a strong government which could, among other things, "resist the encroachment of the assemblies and of mass opinions." In so writing, he established himself as a spokesman for big centralized government in which the president rules supreme and lays down the law to Congress and public, insulated from the pressures of popular sentiment.

So, just the other day, along comes the current issue of Newsweek magazine, containing Lippmann's latest essay protesting President Johnson's conduct of the Vietnamese war. Needless to remark, Lippmann is outraged by the bombing of the oil depots near Hanoi, as he is by just about everything else concerning the war.

Lippmann begins this week's criticism by arguing that Johnson's action is precisely the kind of thing Barry Goldwater advocated, and Lyndon Johnson said he wanted none of, back in 1964. Johnson's recent statement in justification of this asserted reversal—that he was elected President, and he must make the decisions—enrages Lippmann even more.

Johnson's assertion, Lippmann says, is "a claim to arbitrary power, a claim that in making these momentous decisions the president, once he is elected, is bound only by his personal views, not by any mandate or covenant with the people who elected him." Lippmann describes this outlook as "heresy", offensive to American notions of balanced, limited government, in which the president is not supposed to exercise such power.

It takes no trained political scientist to note that Lippmann, with one grand sweep of his oracular pen, has turned the argument of "The Public Philosophy" inside-out. What happened, we are entitled to wonder, to that enfeebled executive beset by the perils and encroachments of "misrule by the people"? Where now is that wispy emasculated president who has been stripped of his rightful prerogatives by an uppity popular opinion which in 1955 has "acquired the monopoly of effective power"?

It would seem impossible for any man called upon to place his opinions before the public to contradict himself more blatantly than this. Which suggests that, if President Johnson is to be criticized for reversing himself on the subject of Viet Nam, Lippmann is hardly the man to take on the job. Perhaps that assignment is better left to such as Barry Goldwater, who knows what he thinks about Viet Nam and the powers of the presidency alike.

Time To Move on Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of July 16, 1966, makes a most telling point, and I commend it to the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues. It is time that the possibility of strikes which impair the economy and threaten the welfare of the people be met in a reasonable, firm, and equitable manner.

The editorial follows:

TIME TO MOVE ON STRIKES

The irresponsible strike of the International Machinists Union against five air lines drags on, and every day it continues the need grows clearer for better machinery to prevent such bludgeoning of the public interest. Yet neither the White House nor the Congress has made a move.

This strike, disrupting normal air transport from one end of the country to the other, surely falls in the category of abuse that President Johnson promised last Jan. 12 to correct. In his State of the Union message, the President said: "I intend to ask Congress to consider measures which, without improperly invading state and local authority, will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest."

The promise sounded good then, in light of the crippling New York transit strike, and it sounds good now when mail and military personnel as well as civilian travelers are being shunted out of normal transport patterns. It's time the promise was kept.

For the IAM strike is legal. The union complied with all the preliminary steps required by law through a year of negotiation. The presidential emergency board that recommended a more-than-fair settlement had no power to enforce its decision. Scenting a chance to get while the getting was good in its pay demands on the suddenly-prosperous air carriers, the union was free to dig in and hold thousands of planes on the ground.

Delay in the absence of an emergency is an old story. When it stops raining, the leaky roof slips out of mind. After the New York subway strike ended, the calls for action similarly subsided.

But the IAM's disregard of all reasonable efforts to prevent a strike raises the issue once more to emergency status. The public interest is heavily on the side of restoring essential transportation. It is in the public interest also to do this without an inflationary award that could set off a series of similar strikes and settlements damaging to the economy.

Organized labor naturally opposes any limitation on its powers, and a Democratic administration indebted to labor may be expected to move warily. But there can be no excuse for failing to move at all—failing even to "ask Congress to consider" what may be done to protect the public against union irresponsibility.

A Potential Presidential Candidate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, in these turbulent and troublesome times, I would like to call to your attention a gentleman who, I believe warrants the Nation's serious consideration because of his high qualifications and capabilities. The gentleman to whom I have reference is Mr. Potter Stewart, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, who was appointed to his position by former President Eisenhower in 1958 at the young age of 43. At the time of his appointment, he was the second youngest Justice to have been appointed to such a position in 105 years. Justice Stewart has distinguished himself in other areas as well, which prompts me to call him to your attention as I feel this young Associate Justice is one who should be given serious consideration as a potential presidential candidate.

Justice Stewart was born on January 25, 1915, in Jackson, Mich., but he lived the major portion of his life in Cincinnati, Ohio, attending the Cincinnati public schools and later Hotchkiss School of Connecticut on a scholarship. Following graduation from Hotchkiss, he entered Yale University on a scholarship and, prior to his graduation in 1937, he served as chairman of the Yale Daily News. He graduated with a B.A. degree and with cum laude honors. He was unable to decide after graduation whether to pursue his interest in law or journalism. But after a year at Cambridge on a Henry Fellowship, he returned to Yale Law School. Justice Stewart was again active in student organizations. He won the Moot Court Competition, became editor of the Yale Law Journal, and graduated in 1941 with an LL.B. degree and cum laude honors.

Justice Stewart was admitted to the Ohio Bar Association in 1941. He began his practice in New York and remained there until 1942 when his Navy Reserve unit was called into active service. He served 3 years on active sea duty and humorously refers to his service as a "sort of a 'Mr. Roberts' Navy—scared to death a very small percentage of the time and bored the rest.". Mr. Stewart may be too modest, however, because during those 3 years of sea duty he received three battle stars.

Upon his discharge in 1945 as a lieutenant, he returned to his law practice in New York and his wife, the former Mary Ann Bertles, of Long Island, N.Y., whom he married on April 24, 1945. He continued to practice there until 1947 when he decided to move his family, which then included a daughter, back to Cincinnati.

Mr. Stewart not only moved back to his home town but into a rich tradition in law and politics which had been established by his father, James Garfield Stewart. Among the many positions his father held were the office of mayor of Cincinnati and member of the Supreme Court of Ohio. At one time he was an unsuccessful Republican candidate for the Governor's office of Ohio. Mr. Potter Stewart was a dedicated attorney but he found himself being lured into public office by 1950 when he began a 3-year tenure as a member of the Cincinnati Council. He served as vice mayor from 1952 to 1953 but rejected the opportunity to campaign for the mayor's office in order to spend more time with his family which was now complete with the addition of two sons.

He was only allowed a year's seclusion from public office, however, for he was soon called upon to serve on the Sixth District U.S. Court of Appeals by President Eisenhower. It was a difficult decision; for although he wished to be a justice, he had not thought the opportunity would come so soon. He wanted to continue his law practice, but he finally decided to accept the opportunity, and on April 27, 1954, Mr. Potter Stewart was appointed to the court of appeals. The courage with which Justice Stewart pursued justice and the ability he showed in deciding issues did not go unnoticed. During the Senate recess of 1958, a vacancy occurred on the U.S. Supreme Court and Justice Stewart was called upon to fill this position.

It is most difficult for one to assess the philosophy of a Justice and even more difficult for a layman to undertake such a task during a few moments on the floor. It is necessary, however, to point out a few of the more pertinent areas where Justice Stewart has made outstanding contributions to our society. He has been categorized as a "swingman," "conservative," and various other classifications; but he defies all categories except that of a "Justice." His voting record places him in the conservative category. Justice Stewart is an advocate of judicial restraint which influences his decisions such as the school prayer rulings, for on three separate occasions he was the lone dissenter, standing for the right of children to voluntarily participate in religious activities.

Conversely, he has been in the forefront of some decisions which have liberalized our criminal procedure with needed reform. Throughout his tenure Justice Stewart has supported the right for accused to have counsel and has, therefore, been the guide for applying the sixth amendment to the States which requires a counsel to be appointed for indigents in all State criminal trials. The examples could continue but the important point is that Justice Stewart has exemplified courage and qualifications both as a speaker for the minority and as a leader of the majority.

His ability and achievements not only compel us to honor him as a capable administrator of the law but obligates us to seriously consider him as a potential candidate for President of our Nation.

The 12-Mile Fishery Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, because of the introduction of legislation to provide a 12-mile fishery limit along the coast line of both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and in view of the important stake California has in this field, covering as it does approximately 1,300 miles of Pacific coast and containing as it does a major fishery industry, I am placing in the Record two documents containing vital and valuable comments on this matter from two outstanding Californians.

The first document is a letter from Dr. W. M. Chapman, director of the division of research for Van Camp Sea Food Co., and a member of the Governor's Advisory Commission on Ocean Resources for California, to Congressman Edward A. Garmatz, chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The other is a report rendered to the same commission in California by its chairman, Dr. M. B. Schaefer, who is also a member of the staff of Scripps Institute on Oceanography, a leading institution of learning and science in the world in its field.

I believe that both statements make valuable contributions to a better and fuller comprehension of what is involved in the proposed measures. Their viewpoints, although spoken on behalf of California interests, are cogent to the total problem. Coming from such outstanding and experienced individuals, I hope they will receive the respectful attention to which they are justly entitled:

Van Camp Sea Food Co.,
San Diego, Calif., July 8, 1966.
Congressman Richard T. Hanna,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Hanna: Attached is a copy of a letter sent today to Congressman Garmatz opposing the adoption of a 12-mile fishery limit (H.R. 9531, S. 2218, etc.).

We think this to be bad legislation, for reasons noted in this letter. We hope that you will be able to assist in preventing its passage.

Sincerely yours,
W. M. Chapman,
Director, Division of Resources.

Van Camp Sea Food Co.,
San Diego, Calif., July 8, 1966.
Congressman Edward A. Garmatz,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Garmatz: The purpose of this letter is to record our opposition to the enactment of H.R. 9531, S. 2218, or any other bill purporting to establish a 12-mile fishery limit for the United States.

The reasons for our opposition are set out more extensively in the attached testimony we presented before the Senate Committee on Commerce this spring with respect to similar bills.

We have operated in the fish business out of California for fifty-two years. We are the largest firm in the United States dealing with fish and marine products whether considered from dollar volume of gross sales or physical volume of product. We are one of a half dozen of the largest fish firms in the world. We are expanding as rapidly as we feel to be prudent both geographically, product-wise, and market-wise. We intend continuing to do so both domestically and foreign (we already operate in nine foreign countries).

When these bills began being considered by the Congress we were operating domestically out of bases in California, Puerto Rico and American Samoa. During this time we made the following expansions domestically:

1). We have participated in the building of the new anchovy fishery out of California and will press forward in expanding that fishery as rapidly as the State will permit it to expand. We are urging the State of California (with some success) to revamp other aspects of state law so as to permit the building of other new fisheries here, such as for hake.

2). In partnership with a number of the largest domestic shrimp producers in Florida and Texas we have invested substantially in the Gulf shrimp business through National Shrimp Producers, Inc. This firm's new plant in Brownsville, Texas, is the largest and most modern shrimp processing plant in the world. After a few months of highly successful operations and sales our partners and we are planning an expansion of this plant in the immediate future which will approximately double its capacity.

3). We have purchased a major interest in a king crab producing firm in Alaska with the intention of doubling its already substantial production and getting it involved in the shrimp, bottom fish, and other underdeveloped resources of the ocean off Alaska. These expansions are already under way.

4). We have taken an option on a substantial piece of waterfront property in New Bedford, Massachusetts, as a plant site anticipatory to developments we have planned for the New England fisheries.

5). We are completing negotiations this week for the purchase of a substantial canning and freezing firm in the State of Washington which we will use as a base for expanding the ocean fisheries out of that State.

6). We are in an advanced stage of negotiation for a firm in one of the middle Atlantic States, which we do not wish to specify publicly at this time, which will give us a base for development of the off-shore fisheries of that region.

7). We have recently extended credits and other assistance to domestic fishermen building several new American flag vessels outside the subsidy program of the United States Government to the extent of several million dollars. We believe that when all of the smoke has cleared away the dollar support volume of our firm to domestic fishermen for the construction of new American flag vessels will compare favorably with that of the United States Government.

8). We have several other plans for enhancement of the United States domestic fisheries that it would be premature for us to disclose publicly at this time. We will push forward on those plans as rapidly as the Congress and the several State Governments create conditions which make such investments of capital and labor prudent. Since as Chairman of the opening session of the recent Marine Technological Society annual meeting in Washington you heard our views on the status and prospects for the ocean fisheries it is not necessary to repeat those things here.

You will note from the above that we are not fearful of Russian or other foreign competition in the offshore fisheries of the United States under present Law of the Sea. We are expanding in all of them where Russians are operating. If we, as capitalists, cannot compete successfully with socialists we think they should have the fish. We think we can.

We think the Congress (and particularly the State Legislatures) should concentrate on creating a better legal and business climate for the domestic fisheries to grow in rather than try futilely to protect us from foreign competition through modification of present Law of the Sea and other protectionist measures.

We firmly believe that the overall, worldwide, national interests of the United States in coastal waters will be best served by a positive (rather than negative) national policy containing *all* of these elements.

1). Internal waters demarcated in accordance with the terms of the 1958 Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone.

2). A territorial sea 3 marine miles in breadth demarcated in accordance with the 1958 Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone, and as set out in the "Outer Continental Shelf Act of 1953", as adjudicated by the United States Supreme Court.

3). All fisheries, both inside and outside the territorial sea, in which the United States has an interest managed in accordance with the provisions of the 1958 Convention on Fishing and the Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas.

4). No fishery jurisdiction outside the three-mile limit beyond that authorized in the 1958 Convention on Fishing and the Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas.

5). Sole jurisdiction over the resources (as defined in the 1958 Convention on the Continental Shelf) of the adjacent continental shelf (as defined in the 1958 Convention on the Continental Shelf).

6). Jurisdiction over the resources of the adjacent continental shelf divided as among the governments of the several States and of the Union in accordance with the provisions of the "Submerged Lands Act of 1953" and the "Outer Continental Shelf Act of 1953", as adjudicated by the United States Supreme Court.

7). The regime of the High Seas managed in accordance with the provisions of the 1958 Convention on the High Seas.

8). The administration of ocean affairs in the United States Government organized along the lines of the Muskie Bill, S. 2251.

9). Adequate support funds from the United States budget to implement the research and other activities called for by the recommendations set out above.

10. Adequate attention at the White House level to a National Ocean Strategy, a National Ocean Program with which to implement it, and a National Ocean Budget with which to fund the program.

Under existing circumstances we cannot forsee any advantage to the United States fisheries from a 12-mile fishery limit which would equal the disadvantages that such a policy would bring to overall United States interests in coastal waters. We hope that your Committee will block the passage of this legislation.

You will note that subsequent to the passage of this legislation by the Senate other substantial elements of the domestic fisheries have studied the implications of this measure on their affairs and have taken views opposing it. At the very least we hope that your committee will hold over consideration of this legislation until the next session of the Congress so that mature consideration may be given to the deep seated effects of it on national and international policy and actions. We think it would be a major error to pass such legislation under hysterical thrust of fear of Russian competition, which, in our considered view, has little to do with the status or prospects of the United States domestic fisheries.

We would be obliged if you would print this statement in any record of hearings published by the Committee in respect of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,
W. M. Chapman,
Director, Division of Resources.

Consideration of the Effects of Foreign Fishery Activities Off the State of California: Outline of the Problem

(By M. B. Schaefer)

BACKGROUND AND RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Since the end of World War II there has been a very rapid expansion of the world's sea fisheries, and a very rapid rate of growth of the harvest taken by them. In 1938, the world marine fish harvest was only about 18 million metric tons. This decreased during the war, and in 1948 had recovered to only about the 1938 level. Since then, annual landings increased to 27 million metric tons by 1957, to 40 million metric tons by 1962, to 45 million metric tons by 1964, and are now in the vicinity of 50 million metric tons. This rapid expansion of the sea fisheries has been stimulated by the need for increasing quantities of animal protein to nourish the world's growing population, especially to provide better diets for men throughout the world.

There has been a particularly rapid growth of the fisheries for the abundant species which can be harvested at a low cost to provide fish-meal, which is used as a protein supplement for poultry and livestock, and fish oil, a large part of which is used to manufacture margarine, and also is used in various industrial products. Nearly a third of the total world harvest of sea fishes is now used for the manufacture of fish-meal and oil.

At the same time, however, there has also been extensive expansion of the fisheries for those species which are particularly desired for the higher priced food markets, such as tunas, flounders, the cod and their relatives, lobsters, and shrimp.

Important elements of the expansion of the sea fisheries have been the development of fleets of vessels capable of fishing at very long distances from their home ports, and the establishment of operating bases in distant waters. Especially active in the development of fisheries distant from their nearby waters have been Japan and the USSR, although the United States of America has also had considerable success in the development of its distant-water tuna fishery in the Eastern Pacific off Latin America, and in the development of distant-water fisheries, and fisheries from overseas bases, for shrimp in the Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean, and in certain parts of the Pacific.

The Japanese have been in the forefront of the post-war development of high-seas fisheries throughout the world ocean. They have long ben a maritime nation, with well developed capabilities in fishing of all kinds, and have a pressing demand for the products of the sea both to feed their own people and as a basis of the export trade which is vital to Japan's economy. Japan has led in the expansion of fisheries for the tunas and spearfishes, conducted by long-line vessels, throughout the world ocean, and has also been active in the development of trawl fisheries for ground fishes and crustacea in the Bering Sea and the Gulf of Alaska, and to some extent elsewhere.

The Russians were not notable as high seas fishermen before the Second World War. However, they have been for the last two decades engaged in very rapid development and expansion of high seas, distant-water fisheries in the North Atlantic and North Pacific Oceans, and are in course of developing substantial operations in the Indian Ocean and South Pacific Ocean. The reasons for this are well known. The Soviet Union, faced with a need to increase the production of high quality animal proteins, and faced with very great difficulties in accomplishing this on the land, has found the sea fisheries to be an important and economical source of a large part of the requirement. There are, of course, additional benefits, of a military and diplomatic nature, flowing from having a great fleet of large, modern fishing vessels operating throughout the World Oceans.

The great post-war increase in the marine fisheries, including the expansion of the distant-water operations of many nations, has led to an increasing number of conflicts concerning rights of fishing and the conservation of the living resources of the sea. Such conflicts are, of course, nothing new in the world, there being a long history of such disputes, going back to the 15th Century and beyond. However, the frequency and importance of such conflicts rose sharply with the rapid burgeoning of the high seas fisheries immediately after the Second World War. This, plus growing interest in other existing and potential resources of the sea, led to actions by various nations designed to secure for their citizens a share of the ocean's riches, and to insure their conservation. This, in turn, resulted in a series of regional and international conferences, culminating in the International Conference on the Law of the Sea in 1958, at which were adopted four conventions dealing broadly with the law of the sea, and the subsequent International Conference in 1960 which attempted to agree on the breadth of the territorial sea and contiguous fishing zones. We will learn of the details of these conventions, and related matters from Dr. Chapman and Mr. Herrington.

The expansion of the high-seas fisheries of the Pacific did not affect California in publicly obvious ways until quite recently. Our distant-water tuna fleet, of course, has been concerned with these matters for a number of years, and the results of disputes with Latin American Nations are reflected periodically in the press, most recently as a result of arrests of tuna vessels by Panama and Peru. The overseas operations of a number of California's large fisheries enterprises continually involve rights of fishing and conservation, but this is not widely known and appreciated.

During the last year, the imminent involvement of California with such matters, much closer to home, has become publicly evident from two events. Firstly, the northward and eastward expansion of the long-line fishery in the Pacific conducted by Japanese craft reached the vicinity of Mexico, causing great consternation among sports fishermen who believe that this commercial fishery may diminish the supply and average size of the tunas and spearfishes that they pursue for recreation. Secondly, the USSR, as a part of its systematic exploration and development of Pacific Ocean fisheries, has recently employed a fleet of research craft in making systematic explorations of the potential fisheries of the Eastern Pacific Ocean from California to northern South America. At the same time, the Soviet production fleet, which has only in the last few years expanded its operations to the waters in the Gulf of Alaska and off British Columbia, has very recently expanded its trawling operations for redfish, hake, and other species southerly off the Washington and Oregon coast. It will almost certainly continue the southerly expansion to the extent that the prior research operations indicate to be warranted.

This expansion of foreign fisheries to the waters of the California Current should come as no surprise. It is well known in many parts of the world that there are major stocks of harvestable fish and invertebrates in this part of the sea which are presently much underutilized, that is, capable of sustaining a larger continuing harvest than is presently being taken. The documentation of this, which is widely available in the open literature, has been summarized in the IMR Planning Study "California and Use of the Ocean," where there were also discussed the legal and institutional handicaps which prevent the citizens of the State of California from fully utilizing these resources. It was also pointed out in that report (pages 14-46 and 14-47):

"Beside the intrinsic desirability of encouraging the expansion of the fishing industry as part of the economic base of California, revision of policies and procedures in the foregoing matters are of importance because the resources in question are not under the sole jurisdiction of the State of California which, therefore, cannot prevent their utilization by others. Beyond the narrow band of the territorial sea, all nations have the right for their nationals to engage in fishing, subject to the provisions of the international law concerning conservation of the living resources.

"The international law concerning these matters was codified in the "Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas," adopted at Geneva in 1958, which has been ratified by seventeen nations including the United States and will come into force in the relatively near future when four more ratifications have been obtained. (This convention entered into force in March 1966.)

"In the meanwhile, even before coming into force, it substantially expresses the rights and duties and the extent of jurisdiction of nations fishing on the high seas. Under this convention, "Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas" means the aggregate of the measures rendering possible the optimum sustainable yield from those resources so as to secure a maximum supply of food and other marine products. Under the provisions of this convention, all nations have an equal right to fish on the high seas but are under the obligation to cooperate in conservation measures to maintain the resources in such condition as to make possible the maximum sustainable yield.

"Only where the adjacent coastal nation can demonstration the need for conservation measures, in accordance with the foregoing definition of conservation and on the basis of appropriate scientific findings, may it apply regulations to other nationals. It is to be noted that the international law makes no mention of recreational activities as having any special priority. We are faced, then, with the situation where the underutilized resources of the California Current which may be caught beyond the territorial sea are completely open to the utilization by fishermen from elsewhere. For example, if the State of Oergon is able to develop a fishery for anchovy or hake, it is perfectly free to use these resources in ways which might not be permitted to citizens of the State of California.

"U.S. vessels from other states cannot be excluded even from the territorial sea off California. Even more important, other distant-water fishing nations, including Japan and the Soviet Union, are continuing the expansion of their distant-water fisheries in the Eastern Pacific. It may confidently be expected that one or both of these nations will be operating on the underused resources of the California Current off our shores within the next few years. Exploratory operations have already been conducted."

SOME DIMENSIONS OF THE PROBLEM

We would, naturally, prefer not to have these foreign vessels operating immediately off our coast, for a variety of reasons inter alia:

(1) There is a fear that these operations might reduce the abundance of those varieties of fish now being used by our fishermen for commercial purposes, and thus diminish the success of our own fisheries.

(2) There is a fear that, in the extreme case, the abundance of some species could be reduced to such a level that the population might be unable to recover even if the fishing pressure were later removed.

(3) In the case of unutilized species, there are fears among some sectors of our population that the reduction of the abundance of these could adversely affect the abundance of the species which we desire to take for comercial or recreational purposes. In any event, we would prefer to have the unutilized species remain unutilized until we get around to using them ourselves.

(4) There is a fear that foreign commercial operations in the California Current might impair the success of the sports fisheries, by reducing the abundance or average size of the fish pursued for recrational purposes. We also wish to give a certain degree of priority to the sports fishery for some species.

With the exception of the last, these are the usual reasons for coastal nations to wish to keep foreign fishing fleets from their adjacent waters.

In dealing with this problem on the high seas off our shores, we face two kinds of difficulties. Firstly, our nation cannot claim rights off our shores which it is not willing to accede to other nations off theirs. Since, for example, we now operate distant-water fleets off the coast of Latin America, and hope to extend these and other distant-water operations, it is questionable whether it would really be to our net advantage greatly to extend our unilateral offshore jurisdiction, even if it were possible. There are also important questions of defense. An increase in the breadth of the territorial sea could greatly handicap the operations of our Navy in many important locations in the World Ocean. Secondly, after much concentrated activity on the scientific and diplomatic fronts, there were finally arrived at the four Conventions on Law of the Sea, all of which have come into force, and to all of which the United States had adhered. The provisions of these Conventions, and especially the Convention on Fishing and the Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas, probably constitute as equitable a system for handling such problems as can be erected at this stage in history.

In any case, one needs to think very seriously on whether, and in what way, he would wish to change the existing international law, even if it were possible. We need, then, to consider the problem in the context of the existing international law of the high seas.

THE RULES OF THE GAME

Dr. Chapman and Mr. Herrington will lead the detailed discussions on this topic. I would, however, at this time like to emphasize four of the aspects most pertinent to the California problem, although they have also been mentioned in the quotation from "California and Use of the Ocean" above:

(1) Although it was not possible at the Geneva Conferences of 1958 and 1960, to arrive at a precise definition of the breadth of the territorial sea, nor the breadth of adjacent zones for fisheries jurisdiction, it is generally conceded that the territorial sea and the zones of exclusive fisheries jurisdiction are quite narrow. It would seem that any combination of territorial sea and zone of exclusive fisheries jurisdiction extending not further than 12 miles from the shore, or from appropriate base lines, can probably be established with little objection from other countries, and would probably stand up in international adjudications. *It is pertinent to note that the USSR asserts, and is willing to recognize, a territorial sea to 12 miles breadth.* Although there are some claims of much more extended fisheries jurisdiction, particularly by certain countries in Latin America, it is highly doubtful that these can be long maintained, since, at the Geneva Conferences, only a very small minority of nations were in favor of such.

(2) The Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas provides a fairly comprehensive set of rules for the international regulation and management of fisheries in order to conserve them. It is to be noted, however, that conservation in this convention is defined as "the aggregate of the measures rendering possible the optimum sustainable yield from those [living] resources so as to secure maximum supply of food and other marine products."

(3) Under this convention, the coastal State has certain special rights, and can, indeed, exercise unilateral jurisdiction over the living resources off its coast when it is in a position adequately to demonstrate on the basis of sound scientific evidence that such unilateral action is necessary to effect the conservation, in the sense defined above, of the living resources. However, it is to be noted that any system of regulations must not discriminate in form or in fact against foreign fishermen on the high seas.

(4) Nowhere in the Geneva Conventions, or elsewhere in the international law, so far as I can ascertain, is any special consideration given to the use of living resources of the sea for recreational purposes. Thus, any priority to the sports fisheries requires handling within the context of the maximum sustainable yield, unless some radical change of the practice of nations in this regard is possible, which I very much doubt.

It is important to note that, so far, the USSR has been conducting its development of the marine fisheries generally in accordance with these rules, although it has not ratified the Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas, and is unlikely to do so in the near future, because of certain compulsory arbitration provisions. It is, of course, to the advantage of the Soviet to develop the fisheries of the high seas on a rational basis within the concept of the maximum sustainable yield, because it has a very large and growing investment in a great fishing enterprise. Petr Moiseev, Deputy Director of VNIRO has written that ". . . Soviet scientist assume that the Pacific Ocean area could ensure a much higher level of sustainable catch than it does now, provided that there is a thorough study based on scientific data and collaboration with other countries concerned in the utilization of aquatic resources and in rational and effective fishery."

It is also to be recognized that Japanese government and industry is becoming more and more reconciled to the development and management of fisheries within the framework of the Geneva Conventions, and is beginning to recognize the necessity of conservation management of heavily exploited living marine resources.

One can, of course, always make bilateral or multilateral arrangements with other nations which do not necessarily need to correspond to the general international rules. Such arrangements, of course, need to be based on some mutual advantages to the parties concerned. We might consider, therefore, on what basis it might be made attractive to the foreign nations with whom we have to deal to curtail their activities on the high seas off California beyond the requirements of the general international law.

SUGGESTED AVENUE TOWARD SOLUTION

I believe that it is possible to arrive at a solution to the problem, within the framework of the existing international law, that can result in our own citizens harvesting a very large share of the sustainable yield of the resources of the high seas off our coast, and, at the same time, will allow for a reasonable priority for sports fishing on the species of greatest interest to recreational users. This solution lies in the direction of developing a highly efficient commercial fishing industry which is able economically to outfish all comers in our home waters. By the full application of science and technology, and in view of the adjacency to home ports, there is no reason why we should not be able to outfish all comers, within the restriction of the maximum sustainable yield, for all the living resources of the high seas of the California Current. On this basis, we can certainly make it unattractive for vessels to come from Tokyo or Vladivostok to fish these waters. Under the protection of a highly efficient commercial operation for the abundant, presently underfished, living resources of the California Current, it should be easily possible to give priority to the recreational uses of some of the less abundant species, which are particularly desirable for sports fishing, along the lines of the recommendation already endorsed by GACOR. At the same time, a highly efficient fleet will also make possible the enhancement of California's own distant-water fishing operations.

During the following discussions, there will be considered in detail many of the matters that I have touched on only lightly. I would hope that on the basis of these discussions, we might arrive at the outline of a policy and program, and specific directions of action, which will best serve the broadest interest of the people of the State of California, which, I believe, will also coincide in large part with the best long-term interest of the whole community of Pacific nations.

The Nation's Water Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is beset today by threats of declining water supply and by pollution of the Nation's once-mighty lakes and rivers. Even though the Federal Government has begun to exercise its responsibility for coping with these great problems, the beginning comes late and amounts to very little. It is imperative that the American people, and governments at all levels, realize the gravity of the water crisis and act effectively to provide solutions.

I introduce at this point two articles on this subject, one from the Chicago Tribune and one from the Chicago Daily News. The Tribune article is a book review, commenting on "The Coming Water Famine," which was written by my colleague, Congressman Jim Wright, of Texas. The Daily News article is a column by Mr. Norman Ross, discussing the scope of the water crisis.

The material follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 10, 1966]

A Plea From a Congressman: "The Coming Water Famine"

(A report by Jim Wright, reviewed by Ronald Kotulak)

The most important thing about "The Coming Water Famine" is that it is written by a United States congressman who is in a little better position than most people to help prevent the famine.

Rep. Jim Wright, who has represented the 12th district of Texas for the last 12 years, exhibits a practical understanding of the serious water problem in this country, how it is growing, and what steps must be taken soon to curb it.

Altho there will not be a shortage of water as such, Wright says, the pollution problem is causing a water famine because it is reducing the amount of good water that is available for drinking and irrigation.

Wright tackles the entire spectrum of water needs—from the need for more cloud seeding, to produce rain, to cleaning up grossly polluted rivers and lakes.

Wright has had a special interest in water problems, since his native state of Texas is not abundantly blessed with it and the misuse of even small amounts of water can cause financial ruin for many people.

His concern for protecting and conserving the mountainous and hilly areas where most rivers and streams have their beginning is especially important. Careless lumbering and mining practices can cause flooding and even changes in the course of a stream.

Wright calls upon his colleagues in both houses of Congress to appropriate more money for developing sound weather modification techniques and giant desalination plants so that fresh water can be drawn from the salty oceans.

What may eventually be needed, he says, are vast projects to bring large quantities of water down from unpopulated areas in Alaska and parts of Canada to quench the thirst of populated areas hundreds and even thousands of miles away. [Coward-McCann, 255 pages, $5]

[From the Chicago Daily News, July 8, 1966]

What Will Be Solution to Our Water Crisis?

(By Norman Ross)

Barely six weeks ago suburban Northlake was hit, and hit hard, by the rains and flooding that caused Cook County to be designated a disaster area.

During last week's extended heat wave, the situation was all but completely reversed, as water-pressure dropped and residents were faced with the prospect of a shortage of water with which to sprinkle their lawns and wash their cars.

Both incidents dramatized yet again our growing problems in obtaining usable water in usable amounts when and where we want it.

As Rep. James C. Wright (D-Tex.) reminds us in his new book, "The Coming Water Famine," it takes 300 gallons of water to produce a single loaf of bread, at least 1,000 gallons to grow a pound of beef and get it to your table, 100,000 gallons to manufacture an automobile.

Despite scare propaganda, there is currently no over-all water shortage and a great deal of local wastage would quickly stop if users were charged what water costs.

New York City, for instance, wastes almost as much water each day as London uses, partly because there is no residential metering.

Also 13 billion gallons of Hudson River water flows past it and out to sea every day, but it's simply too filthy to drink.

"The costs of treatment are simply overwhelming," says Sen. Edward Muskie (D-Maine)—$20 billion to clean up the Great Lakes, for example.

Numerous exciting and expensive ideas are being advanced to deal with our various water problems.

A thin film of alcohol spread over reservoirs can cut evaporation (and make the prospect of drinking water more intriguing?).

A 1,000-mile canal may transport water from the Columbia River basin to the Colorado River area.

Also a grandiose scheme has been advanced that would harness Canada's huge amounts of pure water for the use of farmers in the United States and even Mexico.

But before we bank on that, we'd better consult the Canadians, many of whom are hostile to the idea. Says Blair Fraser in MacLean's:

"Within the predictable future, water will be the sorest issue between us and the United States since the Alaska boundary dispute 65 years ago, if not since the War of 1812."

What can we do about this situation that is, in Interior Sec. Stewart Udall's words, "the conservation scandal of our generation"—one which sees every major river system polluted and results in 100,000,000 Americans drinking water from sources into which 120,000,000 people have dumped their various wastes?

We must disabuse ourselves of any lingering notion that our water-pollution problems are merely a part of Lady Bird's beautification program.

Says chemist Donald E. Carr in "Death of the Sweet Waters": "We need a crash program exceeding the magnitude and pace of the Manhattan Project, which developed the nuclear bomb."

Constituents' Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, in late spring, I sent a questionnaire to all of the residents in my district. About 160,000 poll cards were delivered, and more than 12,000 replies have been received to date in my office.

I found that many of my constituents liked the convenience of the computer card method of expressing themselves. They not only completed the questionnaire, but wrote notes and letters to comment on other matters not specifically mentioned. It was a pleasure to hear from so many of my constituents.

The results of the poll have been widely circulated in the district through my newsletter and by an interested press as well. I would like to bring the poll results—and a few of what I found to be the more amusing and interesting letters—to the attention of the Members of the House by publishing my newsletter, in part, in the Record:

July 1966.

Dear Friends: Thanks to the 11,000 of you who answered my questionnaire. I can say in all sincerity that I have seldom—during my nearly eight years in Congress—been as truly informed as I am today in my constituents' views on such a variety of important issues. They will be an invaluable guide to me as I wrestle with the complex problems confronting our country and the Congress.

Some poll cards are still coming into my Capitol Hill office, but we had to call a halt somewhere so that the computer could do its work.

As usual, the most interesting questions proved to be those producing highly divided responses—such as Number 7. As you can see in the results below, a substantial minority (37 percent) favor expanded trade with Russia and the European Communist-bloc nations. And 32 percent believe Red China should be admitted to the United Nations!

Many cards were accompanied by letters and notes—not a few of which complained that the questions were too complex to answer with a simple "Yes" or "No." I agree—but this is the problem your Congressman must face when the roll is called: His vote must be cast on the issues as presented—not in the form he might prefer.

The notes proved that no mere machine will ever take the "people" out of human beings!

One letter caused a few smiles amongst my staff. It falls in the "answer at my own risk" category. "Recently," the man wrote, "I was considering running for a position such as yours as Congressman, but I didn't know how to go about it. What is the procedure?"

Several constituents displayed real ingenuity in answering the questionnaire, such as the wife who wrote to explain ". . . our answer is a combination of both my husband's and my opinions . . . we had to compromise on 3 questions . . . I conceded 2 and he 1." And then there was the democratic spirit of the father who used the poll as the basis of a round-table discussion with his family of eight. They came up with the answers by voting on each issue!

The cost of living is a disturbing problem to many. I like the way this man put it: "I do not know this country's financial standing, but . . . apple turnovers are more small, less filled, and twice as costly as the ones I bought in 1939."

* * * * *

History Lessons: "Two-year term for Congressmen extended to 4 years? Two is enough. We are no wiser than Washington was." Also: "I am never, I repeat never, in favor of deficit spending. I can't ever believe the first 31 Presidents were wrong about deficit spending and the last 5 were right."

Most replies were heartwarming and encouraging, and all were appreciated. In, around and between my heavy Committee and floor schedules, I am trying to answer each, but the flood of correspondence has made it most difficult.

Questionnaire results

	Yes	No	Percent yes
Do you favor:—			
1. Further Federal action to rid our waterways and air of pollution?	10,539	717	93.6
2. A constitutional amendment to allow voluntary prayer and Bible reading in public schools?	9,329	1,933	82.8
3. Allocating a portion of Federal income back to the States to be used for educational purposes as each State sees fit?	7,860	3,377	69.9
4. (a) A cutback in the great society war on poverty if necessary to hold spending within income?	9,393	1,859	83.4
(b) Continued deficit spending to finance both the war in Vietnam and the war on poverty?	1,650	9,569	14.7
5. Continuing the poverty program in its present form?	1,644	9,574	14.6
6. Economic sanctions against free world countries who persist in trading with Cuba and North Vietnam?	8,137	3,012	72.8
7. Expanded trade with Russia and European Communist bloc countries such as Poland, East Germany, Yugoslavia, etc.?	4,197	7,038	37.3
8. Reduction of U.S. expenditures and expanded participation by other free world countries in foreign assistance programs?	9,693	1,538	86.3
9. Extension of 2-year term for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to 4 years?	7,073	4,183	62.8
10. Admission of Red China to the United Nations?	3,603	7,639	32.5

Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the political leaders of our friendly neighbor to the north, Canada, are spending more of their time of late harranging against the United States and promoting questionable trade deals with Red China and the Soviet Union and Cuba. There are many complications stemming from these policies, and an interesting commentary on the numerous questions raised was in the July 12 edition of the Chicago Tribune. I have leave to insert it in the Record as a continuation of my remarks:

Time for Action

The Canadian government has announced it will sell Russia a minimum of 336 million bushels of wheat and flour worth 800 million dollars in the next three years, the biggest single wheat sale in that country's history, and the shipments eventually could be much larger. Since 1963 Canada has sold the Soviets 448 million bushels of wheat worth nearly one billion dollars.

In addition, Canada has been developing a rich market for wheat in Red China. A three-year contract was signed last April to deliver up to 250 million bushels. Canada also has been promoting wheat sales to Cuba and iron curtain countries in eastern Europe. Thus our friends to the north provide considerable aid and comfort in the form of vitally needed food to communist nations which seek to destroy us.

These transactions offer further evidence if any is needed, that the Communists are still failing to solve their critical food production problems. They also afford evidence of the failure of our government to win any concessions from Canada for American embargo policies which might pinch Canadian trade. The Canadians, of course, can point out that we ourselves followed their original lead and sold some wheat to Russia.

It is unlikely that the United States will have an opportunity very soon to repeat this mistake, inasmuch as Canada has the Soviet market for wheat pretty well sewed up. It is also unlikely that as long as the war in Viet Nam continues those persons in Washington and in the grain trade who think we ought to be selling wheat to Red China will get very far with that idea.

The United States, in fact, no longer has much wheat to sell. In the marketing year which ended June 30 we exported an estimated 850 million bushels, roughly three-quarters of our annual crop. No more than 200 to 300 million bushels was exported for dollars. The rest went abroad under food for peace, which was virtually giving it away.

After a talk with President Johnson, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman said he is considering the need for further increasing federal planting allotments next year beyond the 15 per cent increase announced recently. As of now, the experts are guessing that a year from now our once huge wheat surplus will have dwindled to less than 250 million bushels of uncommitted stocks, only about a sixth of a year's output.

Perhaps President Johnson should be reminded of his statement in his farm message to Congress only last February, when he said, "Our objectives must be for the farmer to get improved income out of the market place at less cost to the government." With the end of the costly wheat surplus in sight, this is an excellent time for the President to back up his words with action, stop talking about planting allotments and subsidies, and get the government out of the wheat business.

Metropolitan Washington Transit Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday the House Judiciary Committee is scheduled to begin hearings on legislation granting the consent of Congress to an interstate compact establishing a mass transit authority for metropolitan Washington.

Approval of this compact by the State of Maryland and the Commonwealth of Virginia is clear proof that both States recognize the immediate need for truly regional transportation planning to meet the problems of the fast-growing Washington area. I am pleased that many perceptive Marylanders have given their strong support to the enabling legislation which I have cosponsored.

I would like to bring to the attention of Congress the following editorial from the Baltimore News-American:

MATHIAS BILL

Baltimore County Executive Spiro T. Agnew is prudent in urging Congress to enact promptly a bill introduced by Rep. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR. to create a Washington Area Transit Authority.

As things now stand, there is real danger Washington will plunge into plans for mass transit—including subways and buses—without taking into account the needs of Marylanders living in Montgomery and Prince Georges counties.

The need for a joint authority—including part of Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia—is self-evident.

As Agnew points out, attempts at coordinated planning so far have been fumbling and uncertain. Immediate establishment of a regional transportation authority like the one proposed in the Mathias bill is imperative—particularly for Marylanders living outside Washington who might otherwise find themselves left out in the cold.

Truman Peace Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 12, I made some remarks about the Truman Peace Center at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. This center for the advancement of peace is a tribute to Harry S. Truman and a tribute to the State of Israel which has devoted so much of its time and energy to the pursuit of peace.

Mr. Joseph Weisberg, the editor of the Jewish Advocate, has written a perceptive editorial about the peace center. This center, he writes, is aptly named after the "former U.S. President, whose career was cast in the mold of so many of the heroes of ancient Jewish lore."

At this point I include Mr. Weisberg's enlightening editorial in the RECORD:

TRUMAN PEACE CENTER

The groundbreaking on Monday for the Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace on the campus of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem marked the second big step towards the creation in Israel of an institution which comfortably fits the prophetic description of the special role of the City of David.

One cannot help but be struck by the aptness of its association with the former U.S. President, whose career was cast in the mold of so many of the heroes of ancient Jewish lore. Thrust into a position of awesome responsibility, seemingly without preparation, and faced with the chilling necessity of having to make epochal decisions, the man from Missouri boldly and forthrightly acted where others might have vacillated.

One of many such decisions was his quick recognition of the State of Israel.

The concept of the Center is magnificent in its simplicity. It would attempt to assure lasting peace through understanding. It will search out and eradicate the seeds of dissent, using all the instruments of science and scholarship.

The prospectus released by the Founders of the Center lists in its curriculum a wide diversity of subjects for study and research. Its scientists would investigate such matters as soil conservation, desalinization of water, the equitable distribution of food as well as comparative religion and international law. It is evident by even cursory examination that such a curriculum goes far and deep into matters which have disturbed the world's tranquility through the centuries of recorded history.

Mr. Truman stated his heart's desire when he said in a speech last January in Independence, Missouri: "When it is time to close the book on my life, I will be comforted by the hope that this Center for the Advancement of Peace will become a major source of light and reason toward the achievement of eternal peace."

Pittsburgh Prayer Walk for Peace in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in my district in the city of Pittsburgh a distinguished group of clergymen organized and conducted a prayer walk for peace on July 11, 1966.

One of the sponsoring members wrote to me saying:

> I myself do not believe we should "get out." I am vigorously opposed to the mentality which wants to "win" in just as short a time as possible regardless of the risks.

With his letter he enclosed a statement issued by the prayer walk sponsors to their clergy brethren expressing concern over the growing escalation of the Vietnam conflict and calling upon both the United States and North Vietnam not to spread the conflict. They urged "all parties to submit the dispute to negotiations, preferably through the good offices of the United Nations."

Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with this statement and call it to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

TO OUR CLERGY BRETHREN:

On Monday, July 11, at 2:00 p.m., we plan a prayer walk for peace in Vietnam. We sincerely hope that you will join with us.

We plan to meet at 2:00 at Rodef Shalom Temple, Fifth and Morewood, Oakland. From there we will march to a Catholic and a Protestant church. We will conduct an informal prayer service in each house of worship. The service will be led by a rabbi, priest, and minister of the respective religious communities. There will be no preaching.

In connection with this march, a statement will be issued to the press stating our grave concern over the growing escalation of the Vietnam conflict. We will urge the United States and North Vietnam not to spread the conflict and will urge all parties to submit the dispute to negotiations, preferably through the good offices of the United Nations.

We believe that as clergy we must continue to make public witness of our desire for peace and justice in Vietnam, not a wholesale slaughter of cities and citizens that would violate all principles of morality. Won't you come with us to walk and pray next Monday?

The time is short, but we feel that the situation is urgent. If you believe in the need for a just peace, we know that you will be with us, even if it means readjusting a busy schedule.

Sincerely,

Rev. Eugene Buchholz, Rev. Edward Biegert, Rev. Christopher R. Sherrill, Rev. Alexander Seabrook, Rev. William Boyd Grove, Rabbi Walter Jacob, Rev. Philip Park, Rabbi Jacob Edelstein, Msgr. Charles Owen Rice, Rev. Raymond Utz, Canon Robert Merry, Fr. Donald McIlvane, Rev. Alexander Stewart, Sponsors.

The Wages of Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on July 18, which is both timely and thought provoking. It contains a frank, fair, and meaningful appraisal of developments in the civil rights movement during the past year. It should be read by everyone.

The editorial follows:

THE WAGES OF HATE

Not quite a year ago, in the wake of Watts, we observed in this space:

". . . the civil rights leadership should turn from its spectacular displays and occasional rabble-rousing and devote itself to a far greater degree to Negro individuals, Negro children, Negro families; to education in the home and group as well as in the school."

It is not an especially original thought, but the intervening twelve-month, sadly, has only given it greater pertinence. For in some ways race relations are if anything worse than then, as the nation now witnesses violence and death in Chicago while Watts itself and other areas are said to be at flash-point.

Part of the worsening is an increasing bitterness toward the white man among some elements of the Negro community. It is strange, although to an extent understandable, that the more civil rights legislation is piled onto the statute books, the more Federal money poured into attempts at Negro bettermen, the more help freely proffered by businesses and individuals—the more the anger rises. To the extent it is understandable, the reason is that none of these efforts have accomplished much.

The darker mood can be sensed in the anti-white militancy of certain groups, perhaps small and insignificant, perhaps not; the ones reportedly arming themselves and training in paramilitary fashion (there was no lack of arms in Chicago these past several days). Not surprisingly, the ugly mood has found sudden articulation in a single phrase, "black power."

The men who gave currency to the term have been trying to tone it down ever since, suggesting it means only a fresh initiative on the part of Negroes to work for their advancement, which would be all to the good. But also present are the connotation of black racism, the demagogic appeal to hatred of the whites, the implication of seizing by force what the majority has built up over generations of painful effort.

In the divisiveness currently afflicting the civil rights movement, such leaders are called militant, as distinguished from "moderates" like Martin Luther King. Moderation, though, seems to have a peculiar definition in this context.

The King organization came to Chicago ostensibly to transform it into a just and open city; in fact, they make no bones about intending to spread civil disobedience in order to force the "power structure" to undertake radical improvements in Negro conditions. There is even a term for that too, albeit a somewhat self-contradictory one: "Militant nonviolence."

Here is the minister himself speaking a few days ago about disrupting the flow of the city: "I know it will be rough on (Chicago city officials) when they have to get 200 people off the Dan Ryan (expressway), but the only thing I can tell them is: Which do you prefer, this or a riot?" Somehow "militant nonviolence" does not seem to have averted night after night of murderous rioting, necessitating the intervention of the National Guard.

Moreover, this "moderate" attitude bespeaks more than a slight overtone of the same bitterness and hatred conveyed by the militants. All in all, it is further alienating the support of the white liberals who have been in the forefront of the movement; what else can be expected when a civil rights leader calls super-liberal HUBERT HUMPHREY a racist?

We fear that the hatred and violence are also alienating the generally passive support of the majority, most of whom, including us, would like to see the Negro get every break a citizen deserves. But who needs this—year after year of disorder, preachment of contempt of the law, taking to the streets in orgies of pillage and shooting?

The leaders might reflect on a simple fact acknowledged by Martin Luther King: The Negro population is only 10% or 11% of the whole. Only a minority of that minority participates in the rampages, but the point for the leaders to understand is that the Negro needs the white man far more than the other way around.

And so we can only end as we did a year ago, except less hopefully. Not all the Federal aid or private help imaginable can lift the Negroes as a group into instant contentment. It will be slow at best, and most of the progress will have to be made by the Negroes themselves. That is the way the world is.

If, instead, the leadership keeps turning on the white man, it is exceedingly hard to be optimistic about the chances for any substantial progress in the future.

The President's Lonely Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the Lincoln Evening Journal of Lincoln, Nebr., one of the Nation's outstanding newspapers, recently published an editorial effectively and concisely pointing out the loneliness of Presidential decisions. I include this editorial in the RECORD:

THE PRESIDENT'S LONELY DECISIONS

The gregarious, consensus-loving President of the United States came to Omaha on Thursday to make a speech heard around the world.

It showed the caliber of the man who holds the reins of government of the United States.

He does what, in his conscience, he feels he must do for the good of the country after weighing the counsel of his advisers. He said as long as he is President he intends to keep the country's commitments, honor its treaties and let the world know that when America gives its word, America keeps its word.

This was warning to the Communists in North Vietnam, the Soviet Union and Red China that the President of the United States makes the decisions; that critics in Congress, the students on the campuses and peaceniks across the country cannot weaken the administration's determination to stand firm in Vietnam, and that there will be no takeover of South Vietnam because of U.S. default.

President Johnson has shown he is willing to make the hard, lonely decisions which only the President can make regardless of what it does to consensus.

It is in times when there is no consensus that the country needs a strong President and in President Johnson the United States has a strong President.

The bombing of the militery targets in North Vietnam is an attempt to halt the escalation of the war by the Communists, no matter how much critics of administration policy put the escalation blame on President Johnson.

Nebraska should be proud the President chose this state as a base to make his forceful statement. Nebraskans may have quarrels with the President's domestic policies, but most are in agreement with his handling of the war in Vietnam.

Like the President, they deplore the war, but find the alternatives even more intolerable. On Thursday Nebraskans saw a determined President and one with the courage of his convictions.

Pioneer Spirit—1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when the pioneers first started filtering into the south Florida area, the only contact they had with their friends and relatives in the North was by mail.

The mailman of the last 1800's and early 1900's did not have to worry about a 70-pound limit or a ZIP code. He had only to worry about Indians, alligators, hurricanes, bandits, and sore feet.

For you see, the mailman, aptly titled the Barefoot Mailman, serviced the hamlets and towns between Baker's Haulover in Miami and Jupiter Inlet by foot, walking the distance of nearly 70 miles on the beach.

As we grew sophisticated and the methods of transportation improved, the route of the Barefoot Mailman was abandoned and assumed by more modern methods.

But each year Boy Scout and Explorer units undertake the trip. They made the same trek under existing conditions as the Barefoot Mailman did some 80 years ago. They sleep on the beach at night and walk by day.

I would like to commend their incentive and sense of history. I only wish that other youths might be inflicted with such a pioneer spirit.

Wither the Earthbound Astronauts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I speak today as a dedicated backer of an improved society. I have had too much humbling experience to expect the achievement of a Great Society. To my colleagues of like persuasion I give this solemn warning; money, however much, and ideals, however high, will not achieve for us the desired purpose. It can no longer be accepted that our role is simply to approve ideas and then grant requested funds. Our responsibilities to the people require a continued attention to assure that the ideas are soundly conceived and effectively executed by the administrators and to determine that the moneys appropriated are wisely and prudently applied.

Now, I am going to demonstrate to you an immense area in which there is very little likelihood that either of the above aims is to be achieved. The newest, most important undertaking of our Federal Government is in the field of environmental improvement. We have at long last accepted as a national goal the responsibility for the reclamation and maintenance of clean air, clean water, and healthy soil. Pollution has become such a damaging intrusion into the sustaining life activities of drinking, eating, and breathing that the threshold of tolerance is being challenged and the health of all is in jeopardy. To undertake the massive requirements of this job in society will call upon resources in our Treasury comparable to the costs of World War II. Virtually billions and billions of dollars in a 10- to 20-year program.

I stand with other of my colleagues saying it is necessary, and even vital, that we commit ourselves to the programs which will clean our environment. Still I say, beware, take care, for we are not proceeding wisely. When you spend massive funds, when you hope to have the talents and products of your private sector and your academic centers you must have organization, control, and cooperation to get results that are not prohibitively expensive.

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that all Members soberly reflect the following analogy. We, in the recent past, embarked upon another challenging and demanding venture, the penetration of space. Into this program we have poured over $22 billion to date. The mission of this program is twofold. First, the successful penetration of space with practical reentry of vehicle. Second, if not paramount in importance, the sustaining of the life of the astronauts in hostile conditions; that is, provision of a quality controlled environment traveling with the space vehicle capable of sustaining life at a level to allow high performance in space tasks.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are all of us astronauts. We are traveling in a spacecraft, 3 billion of us, and we have the same problem in this craft as Glenn, White, Grissom, and others have faced. We must maintain a quality of life supporting environment which will allow for a high performance of the activities which allow for an expansion of meaningful and satisfying living. As we crowd the space of our craft and increase the demands upon the elements of air, water, and land, the management and use of these elements become more critical.

We in Congress created NASA and charged that agency with responsibility for the two missions and hold it responsible for a careful and effective expenditure of funds. In recent years we have developed a set of documents and a pattern of procedures for dealing with the Government in this field. NASA procurement regulations were written to implement the Space Act of 1964. A contractor must consider these along with the board of contract appeals decisions, case laws from court cases and other interpretations. Borrowing from the longer experience of the Department of Defense and with working experience now of its own NASA, through these regulations, has been bringing together the "incompatibles" of the free enterprise system, the great academic society and the Government to accomplish NASA's chief missions, exploration of space and sustaining of human life. The history of both DOD and NASA in procurement is not without some blemish but by and large with the advisory committees as consultants and with procedures of cooperation, there painfully evolved an impressive teamwork, coordination and cooperation which serves the Nation well and will gradually improve.

I ask now, my colleagues, that you turn your consideration to the civilian agencies which we are now involving in the impressive and ambitious program against pollution and waste on land, water, and air: in this case, Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare; Commerce; Agriculture; Interior; and State, to name a few. These agencies procure their goods and services under a set of rules flowing from the Federal Procurement Regulations—the FPR's—which are an implementation of the Office Appropriation Act of 1949. Up to now this procurement has affected U.S. industry very little. It involved housekeeping supplies, office equipment and the like. In the past, civilian agencies of Federal Government have accomplished most of their R. & D. work internally or through grants to higher education and nonprofit institutions.

A new era must be recognized by the agencies involved in the earth environmental health problem. The interface between Government and industry must provide for cooperation, coordination, and a sense for and a definition of mission. Cooperation and coordination must flow between agencies in the same mission and between agencies and industries. The mission concept must come alive as it has for DOD and NASA.

In a recent presentation of this subject matter one of my constituents, Stuart N. Davidson, director of the Contracts Division of Beckman Instruments, presented the problem I am so concerned about in these words:

> To understand this best, let us look again at NASA. We have described its mission as one of space exploration. Of course, NASA's mission can be described in many other ways, but one of the definitions of the mission of NASA must certainly be the "survival of man in a closed atmosphere." The principal problem in Mercury and Gemini, and the principal problem that will be encountered in Apollo, and in orbiting space stations and in manned exploration of the planets will be the survival of a crew in a closed atmosphere. Recent research has indicated to us that men cannot survive long in a closed atmosphere, such as a space capsule or a submarine, unless certain things are done. It is not merely a matter of having enough oxygen along for men to breathe. For if you put a man in a closed atmosphere and provide him all the oxygen he needs to breathe, he will still die sooner or later. This is because the human body emits some 400-odd chemicals through the sweat glands, tear ducts, lungs, etc. Many of those 400 chemicals, which taken in even small quantities, are quite poisonous. A man, even though having enough oxygen, will die from the effects of these poisons even without breathing them. Man simply cannot survive in a closed atmosphere without some means being taken to regenerate his waste material into usable or harmless chemicals.
>
> Consider, if you will, our planet earth. In reality, it is a spacecraft. A relatively small spacecraft hurtling through the uncharted void of space. It happens to be large enough, to have enough mass, so that it holds unto itself its own atmosphere. This enables its crew of three billion people to live on the outside of the capsule rather than on the inside. Nevertheless, the earth and its crew, this spaceship, is a closed atmosphere with limited resources. Now then, up to about 50 years ago there was, very fortunately for the human race, a good ecological balance. The carbon dioxide emitted by animals was taken up by plants and converted back to oxygen and we had a very balanced atmosphere which changed little, if at all, over the centuries. Waste was regenerated through natural means. Today, things are quite different. The crew of three billion on this spacecraft and the mechanisms which they build and operate are busily destroying the environment and upsetting the natural balance severely. The crew, itself, gives off something like 100,000 tons of dead skin, hair, nails and dandruff per day into this environment. It manages somehow to create six million tons of garbage per day consisting of paper bags, towels, empty beer cans, pop bottles, etc. The 200 million internal combustion engines that are constantly running on the highways or in fixed installations give off countless billions of cubic feet of polluted air per day, and into our streams and oceans are dumped millions of tons of industrial and personal refuse and pollution. The most optimistic of scientists when viewing this situation give the human race a few centuries of survival at the present rate. The more pessimistic scientists indicate to us that our great grandchildren may well be the last humans on earth if something isn't done.
>
> Well, something has started. Something is being done about this problem. This is reflected very clearly in the present restructuring of the civilian agencies of the Federal Government who now make, and will be making, their procurements under the Federal Procurement Regulations. In recent months, much legislation has gone through the Congress of the United States. To mention a few of them, there's the Public Health Services Act as amended in the 89th Congress last year; the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 amended last year, the

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; the Water Quality Control Act of 1965; the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965; the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965; the Pure Water Act of 1965; and many other public laws which bear upon the cleaning up of our environment and the health of our citizens.

The President's Reorganization Plan Number 2 of 1966 has gone into effect. It has created the Environmental Sciences Services Administration (ESSA) which includes the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and is probably the administration in the Government which will concern itself most with oceanography. This reorganization plan also created within the Department of the Interior, the Federal Pure Water Control Administration, which will concern itself with stream and ocean pollution. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is constantly being reorganized and is taking giant strides in medical research. Apparently, HEW will administer the air pollution efforts of the Federal Government. The Department of Commerce has written its own procurement regulations to implement the Federal Procurement Regulations. The Department of Agriculture and others have done the same. All of these civilian agencies are starting to make their move to become heavy buyers of research and development and hardware from American industry.

We have been used to regarding the Department of Defense and NASA as the complex within the Government which has the most impact on industry. This is the complex which has done a great deal of procurement in the past with billions of dollars and they are the Federal agencies which have had the most direct influence on American industry. Now, however, the civilian agencies are beginning to enter into contracts, either directly or indirectly, with American industry. One can assume that in view of the urgency of their mission, the survival of the human race, that these civilian agencies, operating under the Federal Procurement Regulations, will soon be spending more money with industry than does NASA today. Further, barring some kind of international strife, these agencies will be more important in the future procurement arena than either NASA or DOD, and probably more important in dollar volume of procurement than both of them put together. The sales opportunities for industry in this arena are fantastic (but that is not my subject today.)

Already, industry is beginning to feel the effects of this new Federal customer. Some specific examples: Five universities scattered throughout the country within the last two or three weeks, have gone to industry with requests to buy certain kinds of scientific laboratory equipment. They have issued purchase orders for this equipment, the "boiler-plate" of which has embodied the requirements of the Federal Procurement Regulations in the same way that contracts issued from the large prime contractors to their subcontractors have, in the past, embodied the provisions of the Armed Services Procurement Regulations for DOD, or the NASA Procurement Regulations for NASA. What I am saying here is that the rules of procurement of the Federal Government are filtering down to industry today through universities. In the past, universities have accomplished their procurement from industry principally with Federal grant money. In most cases they were regarded as purely commercial transactions between the university and industry. Today, this is becoming not so. The universities' purchase orders for scientific equipment in these specific examples have been made under the direction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I have no such specific examples concerning hospital procurements, but I do know that at the hospital level there are some indications that we will soon see what used to be purely commercial procurements made by hospitals and hospital complexes now taking the form of incorporating the requirements of Federal Procurement Regulations and the enabling legislation.

Local governments are procuring a great deal of research and hardware to help solve their local air pollution problems and their water pollution problems. All of these—traffic control, crime detection, air pollution, sewage disposal, water pollution—problems to which the local governments are addressing themselves and under which they are demanding increasing skills from industry, all of these programs are backed up in one degree or another by federal funds. At the same time we are seeing the Federal Government preparing itself to exercise considerable surveillance over the local governments as to their means of procurement. For the Government has taken the position in all of the acts of legislation that I have mentioned before, that in order to get money for these programs—for universities, for hospitals, or for the local governments—the states have got to submit to the Government a plan which must include a means by which the local institutions can show the Federal Government that they are making wise procurements, and that they are passing on to their suppliers all the terms and conditions in these procurements that are required by the legislation and the regulations.

The Federal Government has taken great strides in computerizing the procurement process. The Department of Defense and NASA are leaders in this. We have programs with the Department of Defense—one of them, for example, is called Contract and Performance Evaluation (CPE), where the detail performance of every contractor in the country on every contract above a certain size is retained in a computer's memory. All of these facts are being gathered together by DOD and put on the computer so that at any one time one can read out what is going on in the contracting area; how the prime contractors are handling procurements; what kind of performance they are getting from each and every subcontractor, etc. Audits are also posted in this great memory so that the DOD has a readout available of the whole procurement process.

With this kind of information and these kinds of techniques available, one can be sure that the Department of Commerce; Health, Education and Welfare; Interior; indeed, all of these Federal civilian agencies who will be the biggest procurers from industry in the next ten years will use them. They are going to follow the same techniques so that all this federal money that flows down from the civilian departments to local governments, hospitals, universities and out to industry is going to be watched carefully. They have the mechanism to examine the whole contracting process and it will be examined in some great detail.

The point I am trying to make with all of this is that the procurement people—the buyers—in educational institutions, in medical institutions, and in local governments are going to have to begin to understand more intimately the federal procurement process. They are going to be audited, for indeed the legal right of audit rests in the Federal Government. They are going to be audited as to how they spend this money, their procurement methods, the degree to which they solicit competition, conduct price analysis, etc. They are going to be examined carefully. They are, in short, going to have to learn to live with the Federal Procurement Regulations (the FPR's) in much the same way as those of us who have been in the space and defense business have learned over the years to understand and abide by the Armed Services Procurement Regulations, in the case of DOD, and NASA Procurement Regulations, in the case of the space agency.

Finally, and most important, if this is to be an efficient government-industry partnership, the same kind of rapport now existing between industry and government in the space and defense arena must be established with the civilian agencies so that the mission of survival can be accomplished.

Mr. Davidson speaks from long, practical experience in the interaction between government and business at the interface of procurement. His observations are most penetrating and significant. I would add that Congress must be as aware on its part as this industry representative has demonstrated he is. The situation demands that we be prepared to amend and adjust the implementary legislation supporting bills providing the major thrusts into environmental health. We must be concerned with procurement procedure with coordination of efforts for cooperation in projects so we meet the mission requirements. We must expect and encourage the painful yet necessary development of lines for adjustment in the face of inevitable new areas of "incompatibility between the Federal Government and its partners in both the public and private sector. We must demand and help develop new methods of measurement so that we can distinguish between real performance and a "snow job." We must be aware of the critical balances which are constantly present in the areas of material and manpower where the Federal Government and its partners are making excessive demands on limited quality and quantity. Finally the appropriate committees should keep a constant, constructive surveillance else these important programs will be at best wasteful and at worst miss completely their important, vital mission. Only in this way can the achievement match the promise in this new and noble experiment. Only thus can we extend the comfort and the length of the journey for the earthbound astronauts.

The tocsin has been sounded, my brethren, which of you will answer?

Twenty-sixth Anniversary of the Occupation of the Republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, 26 years ago the armed forces of the Soviet Union began the occupation of the Republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, thus ending the existence of these countries as free and independent nations.

That invasion and occupation and the imposition of the Soviet regime was a flagrant act of aggression and continues as such today.

The Soviets have deported to their country more than a half million people from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, regardless of the fact that the U.S.S.R. joined the Genocide Convention.

In addition to those deportations the Soviet Union is forcibly resettling young people from these countries in Soviet Russia, thus obliterating their national identity by Russification, atheism, and Communist indoctrination.

The U.S.S.R. does not have any legal basis for the occupation of these countries but is trying to justify its domination by fraud and usurpation of the will of the people. The United States has never recognized the seizure and occupation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union and has upheld and restated this position in a recent official publication of the Department of State—Treaties in Force.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the oppressed people of these once independent nations will be able once again to gain their freedom—a freedom they so richly deserve.

We Must Not Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, this week will mark the eighth annual commemoration in this country of Captive Nations Week. Since 1959, at the request of the Congress, our Presidents have issued the call to all Americans to remember the sorry circumstances which prevail within the area of Europe dominated by the presence or fear of the Red Army. It behooves all who love the blessings of liberty, who believe that freedom and national self-determination are just goals of political action to once again reassert their feelings on the existence of the Communist dictatorships in Eastern Europe.

We who have been nurtured in the traditions of justice and the right of man to govern himself cannot prudently or morally stand by and not decry the terrible state of affairs in the captive nations. It is imprudent to ignore an evil which threatens all we hold dear. It would be an insult to our beliefs not to proclaim the deepest sympathy for the plight of millions now held in bondage by the criminal techniques of Communist domination.

We have our roster of heroes who have fought and often died to make the heritage we take so easily for granted a living and strong reality. We may well not remember that the cause of freedom suffered a grievious, but not mortal, blow when other national patriots behind the wall of Soviet armed power fought for liberty and perished in the attempt. The names of such men as Nikola Petkov, of Bulgaria and Jan Masaryk, of Czechoslovakia should be engraved on the tableaus of those who held human freedom and dignity dearer even than life.

Thousands died opposing the imposition of Communist regimes. Thousands more perished or suffered terribly in the years which followed when the new tyrannies were destroying all opposition. In some cases, large segments of the native population were deported to camps in the Soviet Union when that state unilaterally proclaimed that small historic nations were henceforth part of the Communist Empire of Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, these events were not a tragedy in the sense of being caused by the actions of the small nations of Eastern Europe themselves. The creation of Communist puppets was the result of the cynical and cruel acts of the leaders of the Soviet Union. The nations now called "captive" were the victims of both the desire for dominance which has long characterized the Russian state, and of the sordid urge to impose communism even when it was not the choice of the people. These brave nations were the victims of one of the most colossal robberies of history. At just the time when they felt that the future was bright with promise, when the hideous terror of Nazi occupation was ended, when the course of national development was apparently clear, they were thrown into the hands of groups of men who would not serve the interests of the people.

The Communist conspirators who came to absolute power were interested in two things. One was to stifle all opposition to the satisfaction of their shameful desire for total power. The other was to see that the demands of the source of their strength, the Soviet Union, were met. The result was not only the destruction of liberty, but subservience to the goals of an alien state.

Mr. Speaker, foreign military power and a local daemonic police apparatus cannot perpetually hold down the legitimate aspirations of human beings for liberty and dignity for themselves and their nations. We may be sure that our call to the enslaved peoples during this week will not go unheeded. They will know that our belief in their eventual deliverance is correct. Let me then extend my personal wish to these brave, unfortunate peoples, that the light of freedom will soon shine again in their lands.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago the Congress set aside this week of the year for the observance of Captive Nations Week. Much of our attention has been focused this year on the war in southeast Asia, but we dare not forget that already for more than 24 years the peoples of East Europe have been dominated by an alien power, mainland China for 17 years, Tibet for 15, North Vietnam for 12, and Cuba for 6 years.

This occasion is a solemn reminder of the tragic plight of courageous people, of the violation of promises, treaties and international law, and of the responsibility of freedom loving people everywhere to pursue a course that will bring peace to those in captivity.

In the last several weeks our press has reported new efforts to break down trade barriers into these countries, new endeavors to establish cultural exchange, and new attempts by captive nations to obtain a greater measure of freedom. We continue to hope for improvement in enslaved countries and look forward to the time when there will be no more captivity.

It is my hope that all Americans will join in observing this week to reaffirm their concern for those in restricted lands.

National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Director of National Security and Foreign Affairs for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC, retired has made a contribution to the continuing Vietnam policy debate in a column in the July issue of the VFW magazine. General Hittle, recently returned from a study of the situation in Vietnam, argues strongly about the dangers of accepting a coalition government in South Vietnam as a genuine solution of the problem of Communist subversion and aggression.

Under unanimous consent I include this statement in the RECORD as it is deserving of the attention of my colleagues:

NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Brig. Gen James D. Hittle, USMC (retired) Director of National Security and Foreign Affairs)

If there is one thing we've got too much of these days, it's confusion.

In particular, there is confusion about things that are basic to our way of life and to our ability to preserve it.

For instance, there's the matter of the war in Vietnam. Too many people, some of whom should know better, are urging a coalition government with the Reds, even a ceasefire agreement.

Advocates of such schemes forget a very basic fact of national life—and death. One of the greatest Americans who ever lived, General Douglas MacArthur, said it so well: "In war there is no substitute for victory."

Those who would violate this principle by taking the Communist aggressors into the Vietnamese government are saying, in effect, that the Communists can be trusted. Those who believe this are not only confused, they also have a bad memory.

If the history of the world since the Reds took power in Russia teaches anything, it's this: communists make promises only to break them when it's to their advantage.

The Reds have repeatedly demonstrated that they look upon a coalition government merely as a stepping stone to full Communist take-over.

There's too much confused thinking, also, in the idea that a cease-fire will solve the problems of war in Vietnam.

The cease-fire advocates overlook another very basic thing—the nature of the Vietnamese war. This is a war without a front. It is a conflict that swirls through the countryside. In such situations where the war is everywhere, there can be no cease-fire anywhere.

Why? Because to have a cease-fire there must be at least a vaguely definable frontline such as, for instance, in Korea.

In the kind of war being fought in Vietnam a cease-fire would only be a license for the Reds to win by terror and subversion while we and our allies would be shackled by our promises to abide by a cease-fire agreement.

Those who are calling for a coalition government and a cease-fire are confused over the difference between stopping a war and winning one.

Wall the City or Support the Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of a district in the Chicago metropolitan area, I have been concerned over the violence which erupted in Chicago late last week and the deliberate definance of law and order, vandalism, and other actions which produced anarchy in a portion of the city.

The Suburban Index, which serves the South Side of Chicago and adjacent suburban communities, carried a very appropriate editorial on this subject in its July 17 edition, and I have leave to insert it in the Record as part of my remarks:

WALL THE CITY OR SUPPORT THE POLICE

What does tomorrow hold?—will the law abiding finally be forced to barricade themselves in walled cities as police superintendent Orlando Wilson has seriously suggested, while the lawless roam the land to commit their crimes at will?

With a Supreme Court going all out in its interpretation of the law to protect the criminal and thwart the police at the expense of the public; with zealots and do-gooders including members of the clergy, urging a complete breakdown of the law on the grounds that the end justifies the means no matter that the innocent are the victims—those walled cities may be nearer to reality than we think.

But surely it is a repugnant solution. Right now each and everyone of you can do something concrete to protect your home, your family and your neighborhood that we believe will be better than any wall. Write to Mayor Daley and Police Superintendent Wilson. Let them know that you support them in their pledge to enforce the law no matter who the criminal or what the crime.

They have both publicly stated in the wake of recent riots that no one is above the law and it shall be enforced. Back them, they need your encouragement and you need their guts. Both are being subjected to terrific pressures—let them know you are with them.

The letter need not be long—just a sentence will do, but the knowledge that you agree will help tremendously.

One letter addressed to Mayor Daley and mentioning Supt. Wilson and the police will do the job. Write Mayor Richard Daley, City Hall, Chicago, Illinois.

Report From Congressman Lester L. Wolff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important functions of a Congressman is to keep his constituents informed on the major issues of the day. I would like to include in the Record a report to my constituents stating my opinions in recent developments and activities in Washington:

A REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN LESTER L. WOLFF, THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, NEW YORK

DEAR NEIGHBOR: The developments in Washington that affect today's fast-moving events in the world, the nation and in our District make it vitally important that you be constantly apprised of the active part your Congressional representative has assumed and will continue to assume in shaping these developments. In order to keep you informed of my activities in Washington on your behalf, I shall continue to send you this report. I am presently engaged in these activities: Viet Nam, space, foreign affairs, jet noise, conservation, oceanographic development, consumer protection, industry and job development on Long Island, Post Office matters, draft problems, Veteran affairs, and current government appropriations. I thought you would be interested in a more detailed report on some of these matters.

VIETNAM: THE BOMBING OF HANOI AND HAIPHONG OIL DUMPS

My position: On the morning of the day that I learned the Administration had ordered the bombing of oil supplies at Hanoi and Haiphong, I made the following statement on the floor of the Houes:

"It is easy to destroy. Our capability goes much further than the destruction of oil dumps. We can destroy all of Viet Nam and much more, if we so desire. However, our purpose is not to destroy a nation, but to permit a people the opportunity to build a nation. This is a more difficult task. The consequences of our recent action only await time. We have taken a big chance. I would have preferred our giving one more try for a bilateral cease-fire. Since there are none of the 'King's Men' around, we can't put back that which has fallen. I hope that this is not a prelude to one-upmanship that would bring us into an expanded war instead of the intended peace. People who have nothing to lose become desperate people. Desperate people do desperate things."

TRADING STAMPS ADD TO COST OF FOOD

My fight to alert consumers to the widespread abuses of the inadequately regulated trading stamp industry, which result in increased food costs, has at last been confirmed by a U.S. Government-sponsored report. The long-awaited results of a National Commission on Food Marketing independent survey corroborate the findings of my exhaustive Congressional investigation of the industry's activities in the food field. My investigation, conducted at my personal expense, concluded, as did the Commission report, that the billion-dollar trading stamps industry, which does a large part of its business in the retail food trade, makes its swollen profits at the cost of adding considerably to your food bill.

The results of the President's Committee report bear out my contention that, while a properly regulated stamp industry can perform a valuable promotional service to the retail food business, the present uneven state regulations are entirely unsatisfactory and cost you, the consumer, an added 2% each week on your grocery budget.

The independent report of the Commission cites trading stamps as "a form of promotion whose costs are borne largely by consumers" and points to the "1964 figures of 2 billion dollars spent for advertising food and 680 million spent for trading stamps by retailers as significant in the size of the food bill that year." Recent rises in the cost of living have been substantially the result of increased food prices.

Thus, the Commission survey results support the basic fact that emerged from my informal Congressional inquiry: that part of the inflationary trend resulting from spiraling food prices is attributable to the lack of proper regulation of the trading stamp industry. Before the close of the 89th Congress, I shall have introduced a bill authorizing the creation of a federal trading stamp agency to bring about the end of practices that dip into your pocket.

YOUR FEDERAL TAX DOLLAR AT WORK IN THE DISTRICT

As your Congressman, I believe it is my responsibility to secure for the District as many federal grants and contracts as possible. In the past week I was gratified to announce the latest in a series of grants and contracts awarded in the District during the past 2 years: a $333,000 grant from the National Institute of Mental Health for a community mental health center in Woodbury; a $74,105,495 Navy contract to Grumman Aircraft for production of A6–A aircraft; a $65,000 grant from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration toward the cost of sewage plant additions in Great Neck; a Post Office Dept. contract for a new 20,000 square foot post office in Roslyn Heights.

OFFICIAL TRIP TO ARGENTINA

My visit to Buenos Aires was made on behalf of our House of Representatives at the invitation of Dep. Arturo Mor Roig, then President of the Argentine National Congress. On my return from Argentina, less than a week before the coup there, I called the political situation in that country 'volatile' and one in which anything could happen. My evaluation of the situation was based on 5 days of intensive talks with President Arturo Illia, his Min. of War, Gen. Castro Sanchez, Min. of Defense Leopoldo Suarez, and others in the congress, the Illia cabinet and military. All expressed to me deep concern over the threat posed to their government. They also voiced their determination to do all in their power to preserve the constitutional government in Argentina, a course our own nation and I favored.

The ousting of Illia's administration is, to my mind, a real setback for Argentina. He had served for almost 3 years and had done more than any other man to repair the economic ravages to his country caused by years of Peronism. He had ambitious plans, both economic and social, designed to complete his nation's recovery.

When I returned to Washington after my 5 day visit to Argentina, I was able to supply valuable information on the Argentine situation to Washington officials responsible for our Latin American policy.

TAPE A MESSAGE TO THE MEN IN SERVICE

To help keep the lines of communication open to our servicemen overseas, my Port Washington office will continue its tape-a-message service and forward your message at no cost. To avoid delay, call 767-4343 for an appointment.

AN INVITATION

If you desire more detailed information on the matters reported above, please do not hesitate to contact me. Planning to visit Washington? Visit our office (Room 1629, Longworth Building). To those of you planning vacations in the coming months, may I extend my best wishes for a most enjoyable time.

Sincerely,

LESTER L. WOLFF.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Captive Nations Week, following as it does our own Independence Day here in the Unted States, is a time to hail the forcefulness and the fortitude of those peoples of Eastern Europe who have maintained their identity and independence despite all the vicissitudes and would-be dominance to which they have been victim.

Captive Nations Week is a reminder to all the world that the spirit of man prevails no matter what the physical conditions to which he is subjected. The nations which have been caught up in the net of Communist domination have never ceased to exist as entities, personalities in their own right. The Iron Curtain which fell around them never smothered them. The dominance of that communism which sought to amalgamate them into one cohesive mass has never succeeded in erasing their identities. Each of the captive nations is today as readily identifiable as it was before the heavy hand of modern communism fell upon it.

Among these nations were those whose history of independence dates from the Middle Ages—such as Poland, Lithuania, Hungary. Some were nations of great modern development, such as Czechoslovakia. Whether by tradition or recent training, all were nations whose independence had been hailed in the 20th century with its emphasis upon the self-determination of peoples.

The attempted subjugation by communism was, therefore, the more to be deplored. It was too, however, the more to be withstood. And it has, indeed, been withstood valiantly in the hearts and minds of the people. The basis of the tenacity of separate statehood lies in the spirit of the people who compose these individual nations. There endurance, their courage, their patriotism have persisted in the current era as they persisted before communism became a threat to the free world. These nations shared a history of collective sacrifices within their separate groups, of incredible hardships endured because of their determination to maintain their identity in spite of all aggression, and their faith in the enduring fruits of their efforts.

In recent decades we could but deplore the plight of these capitive nations. Theirs was a common fate of political domination over peoples whose national spirit had never succumbed, whose national characteristics had never been overcome, who carried a torch lighted by a memory of past freedom and shining hope for the future.

In the last few years there seems to have been renewed hope. There have been brave signs of protest against the regime superimposed by communism. There has been open defiance of it and evidence of a renewed independence of spirit.

In honoring Captive Nations Week we hail this love of freedom, this spirit of liberty, and the faith that endures and motivates man to withstand all domination.

San Antonio Express Comments on James Farmer Being Paid $80 a Day as Antipoverty Consultant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, much understandable concern has been expressed concerning the exorbitantly high salaries that are being paid to so many who work for the Office of Economic Opportunity. Scores of instances have been disclosed not only of annual salaries ranging from $10,000 to nearly $30,000 being paid to employees, but also many others who are hired as "consultants" and whose duties are not defined or spelled out, and who receive from $50 to $100 a day.

A recent example, referred to in an editorial in the San Antonio Express, is concerned with the case of James Farmer, a consultant.

The editorial follows:

POVERTY WAR HAS SURPRISES

Sargent Shriver, who usually directs the nation's war on poverty from his command post in Washington, was on an official inspection in the field, checking the extent of progress being made in the numerous Texas programs last week.

Quite properly, Shriver is on the alert for conditions signifying bungling and waste. He may find some bureaucratic deficiency, but we expect it to be negligible by comparison to anti-poverty programs in some other parts of the country.

When he finishes his tour of Texas, the national director of the Office of Economic Opportunity might well take heed of the situation in New Jersey. There the state OEO has retained as a consultant the former national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, James Farmer, to advise on adult literacy opportunities.

Farmer is to receive $80 per day for some 35 days that he is expected to work. As a temporary job, it should do until something permanent can be found for the civil rights leader. The appointment also will stimulate interest among the corps of literacy instructors in San Antonio and cause some of them to question the financial return on their own laudable efforts.

By New Jersey standards, the Texas bilingual experts are pikers at the pay window. Either Shriver is looking for bungling and waste in the wrong place, or Texas anti-poverty specialists are selling themselves short.

The national director should set the record straight on this seeming variance in economic opportunities between New Jersey and Texas.

Winning Essay in Fort Detrick Contest, "My Contribution to Good Citizenship"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent essay contest for military and civilian personnel at Fort Detrick, entrants were asked to write on the subject, "My Contribution to Good Citizenship." The essays submitted in general expressed perceptively the obligations of citizens in this challenging era.

The grand prize in this contest was awarded to Mr. Donald E. Leatherman, of the Applied Aerobiology Department of Fort Detrick. At ceremonies last month, it was my pleasure to present Mr. Leatherman the award of $50 and an American flag which had been flown over the Nation's Capitol.

I am pleased to bring Mr. Leatherman's winning essay to the attention of the Congress:

MY CONTRIBUTION TO GOOD CITIZENSHIP

(By Donald E. Leatherman)

The world, and an America inextricably involved in it, has entered an era of instability, breath-taking changes, terrifying hazards, and blinding promises. Never before have American citizens been confronted with such mighty dangers and, conversely, such glorious opportunities. In the face of a communistic wave which engulfs every landmark of democracy, we are challenged to create out of democratic impulses the conditions of international and domestic peace, stability, and security on which the age-old hopes of mankind rest. It is not only our freedom that is at stake but also the dream of a happier and more righteous society. The task of democracy is forever that of creating a freer and more humane experience in which all share and to which all contribute.

Since democratic government can rise no higher than the intelligence, purpose, and righteousness of the individual citizen, it is for each of us to do his part to preserve and enrich our great inheritance, enabling democracy to reach its highest fruition. Fundamentally, the vitality of our democratic system depends not on any spectacular performance of a few patriots only, but rather on the devoted and conscientious efforts of countless citizens, myself included, who apply religious ethics to civic life by demonstrating a willingness to subordinate every lesser interest for the larger good.

The American concept of democracy finds its fullest expression in the roots of religion. As Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt pointed out in The Moral Basis of Democracy: "The principle of the responsibility of the individual for the well-being of his neighbors, which is akins to 'Love thy neighbor as thyself' in the Bible, seems always to have been a part of the development of the democratic ideal which has differentiated it from all other forms of government." Since humanity is but multiplied neighbors, this principle constitutes the motivating force in human relations, promoting self-respect by making it possible for a man to be as kind in his associations with others as his heart would dictate. It involves something larger than self, untainted by private purposes or selfish ends.

Too often we are prone to think of our citienship too narrowly and fail to realize its relationship to our lives as a whole. The specific tasks of citizens—voting, doing jury duty, taxes, and serving in the armed forces—are of the highest importance; but back of them stands life itself—the art of living so that life shall be free and worthy of the human race.

We cannot separate the exercise of our civic duties from the rest of our lives. Our aspirations, interests, ideals, tastes, and habits influence the performance of our civic duties. If our lives are noble and rich, our citizenship will express that nobility. If we are good parents, we are more likely to be good voters, since our purpose as parents will influence our decisions at the polls. If we are good workers with joy and a sense of perfection in our daily tasks, we will make better jurors, because through our labor we will have penetrated the common heart of humanity. If we have a spirit of good will and mutual helpfulness in our relations with family and neighbors, that spirit will be our contribution toward a wholesome state of the common mind. On the other hand, if we are dishonest in our thinking and indifferent to the well-being of others, these negative qualities will degrade the public life.

Any valid claim of a contribution to good citizenship must be firmly based on the realization that our prized liberties are safeguarded only as we see that our rights as citizens involve concurrent responsibilities. Citizenship is more than the calm assertion of privileges; it is the glad assumpton of duties. It best manifests itself in service that neither doubts, nor counts the cost, nor asks recognition. With personal initiative and a readiness for sacrifice, we must fulfill our responsibilities to the best of our abilities, and leave a country richer than we found to a society better than we found. Certainly, good citizenship is due payment for a beloved land whose resources give us so much to live on and whose freedoms give us so much to live for!

These conceptions of duty have become my convictions of duty. We tend to become what we will become, what we sacrifice for, and what we work toward. Though classified as "average" among the multitude of citizens, it is still within my power to contribute these qualities to good citizenship: a determintaion to earn my own way by useful service; a personal interest in human welfare that seizes every opportunity to help others improve their lives; and a deep concern for good government combined with sustained study and action. The specially gifted may contribute more, but no man dares contribute less if he values human dignity and worth inherent in American citizenship.

It is We, the People, who must prove to the world that a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal can survive, and in its survival advance the cause of free men everywhere. Our destiny lies in our response to our noble heritage and to the unprecedented moral challenge of our time—a challenge which requires that we draw on our deepest sources of courage and responsibility to promote freedom, equality, justice, and humanity. These opportunities are our heritage and their fulfillment our obligation as American citizens. We cannot free ourselves from the responsibility that everyone has for whatever the future may bring. As James Truslow Adams warned: "The alternative is the failure of self-government, the failure of the common man to rise to full stature, the failure of all that the American dream has held of hope and promise for mankind."

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, each year at this time we observe Captive Nations Week, dedicated to the millions of people suffering under the yokes of communism in the countries of Eastern and Central Europe who are our silent allies in the worldwide conflict between the forces of liberty and Communist tyranny. This observance has become traditional since a unanimous Congress adopted a resolution designating this particular week as Captive Nations Week in July of 1959.

Although east-central Europe today is a showcase of Communist failures, as shown by the continuing nationalism and allegiance to Western democratic ideals of the peoples within this area, progress toward the liberation of the captive nations has been laborious and too slow to satisfy popular demands. The "liberalization" of the totalitarian rule in Eastern Europe is still held firmly in check by the Communist regimes, which invariably draw the line the moment the Communist Party's monopoly on power and ideas is threatened. The status quo in east-central Europe has been and still is perpetuated by the force of the Communist overlords; little progress has been made toward securing the right of self-determination; the peoples remain under alien rule and are still denied basic human rights.

We in the free nations must continue to stand fast by our solemn pledges to defend freedom and self-determination where it still exists and to help extend it wherever possible, if we are to keep alive the hopes of enslaved peoples so they will continue their struggle and their efforts for survival. We must reaffirm the conviction that a policy of peaceful evolution must not digress from the primary objective—an east-central Europe unfettered by totalitarian regimes. By reaffirming our ideals embodied in the concept as represented by Captive Nations Week, we encourage these peoples and contribute toward the ultimate achievement of that goal. We help to lighten their burden of suffering and degradation.

Of utmost importance to the righteous cause of these people is our discussion of this problem, which focuses attention on the treatment of these captives by their Communist masters and helps to expose the ruthless face and features of Communist imperialism for all the world to see. In these days of swift historic changes, when east-central European Communists are themselves beginning to speak out, even by inference, of the illegality of Soviet imperialistic annexations, the free peoples and their governments have an added duty of being heard clearly and forcefully on this key problem.

It gives me pleasure to join in the observance of Captive Nations Week as a way of demonstrating our support of these nations in their efforts to gain freedom to chart their own futures. It is our way of expressing renewed assurance to all captive and oppressed nations of the world that we stand for freedom, justice, and human dignity for all mankind.

Treaty for Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, hope grows for the early adoption of a treaty guaranteeing peace and freedom in space.

President Johnson originally proposed such an international agreement, and Russia followed with quite similar recommendations.

Now the Washington Evening Star notes that the Soviets have indicated they are willing to accept the course favored by the United States and have a United Nations group get work on a draft next month. This would enable the U.N. General Assembly to consider a specific treaty proposal in the fall.

If all goes well, the Star believes a treaty could be adopted before the year ends. And in an editorial which I offer for the RECORD, the newspaper says an effective agreement could not come too soon—because men are likely to land on the moon by 1970 at the latest.

[From the Evening Star, June 28, 1966]

TREATY FOR SPACE

The outlook has brightened for an early Soviet-American accord on a treaty—to be worked out in the United Nations—demilitarizing outer space and guaranteeing that all celestial bodies, such as the moon, will be explored and exploited solely for peaceful purposes.

In a turnabout of sorts, the Russians have modified their past insistence upon deferring this matter until the September meeting of the General Assembly. Now they are willing, or so they have indicated, to follow the course favored by the United States—namely, to have the U.N. Outer Space Legal Subcommittee put the project in motion early next month in an effort to draft a treaty for immediate submission to the Assembly's fall session.

This is a heartening prospect, the more so because our government and the Kremlin seem to see almost eye to eye on what needs to be done. Each has just submitted to the U.N. a proposed treaty, and the texts of both are strikingly alike. Among other things, they call for peaceful cooperation in spatial endeavors; they bar all nations from claiming sovereign rights on the moon or planets beyond; and they forbid the stationing of mass-destruction weapons or the building of military bases on any celestial body or in the surrounding environment.

Given the Kremlin's apparent readiness to join the United States in starting the negotiating process without further delay, the adoption of an effective space treaty should be possible before the year ends. It will come none too soon, now that men are likely to land on the moon by 1970 at the latest.

Save the Grand Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to reassert my opposition to the construction of two new dams on the Colorado River. Certainly we must find new sources of water, but we cannot afford to destroy great natural resources—such as the Grand Canyon—at the same time.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include an article by Charles Bancroft from the Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa., June 25, 1966, at this point in the RECORD:

LANDMARK IN PERIL

(By Charles Bancroft)

Conservationists all over America are concerned with the proposal of the Federal Bureau of Reclamation to build two large dams on the Colorado River—the Marble Gorge upstream from the part of the Grand Canyon under national park protection, and the Bridge Canyon downstream.

The Bridge Canyon Dam, conservationists contend, would create a reservoir impairing the gorge of the Grand Canyon National Monument and part of the National Park.

From the Grand Canyon Monument one gets a beautiful view of the Colorado River flowing, like a crumpled ribbon, 3,000 feet below.

If the building of this dam is approved the conservationists say, it will mean destroying invaluable geological and archeological records, the death of a river two billion years old and the wiping out of 164 miles of wilderness.

ORGANIZE OPPOSITION

If future generations are to continue to enjoy the splendor of the Grand Canyon, a tremendous effort must be made to organize the American people against this scheme.

The primary reason stated for building the dams is to supply more water for dry areas. It is felt, however, by many opponents of the plan that there are better ways of supplying water to those areas in need.

A great deal of the water would be used to generate electricity which could be sold off to pay the cost of construction. That part of the proposal, of course, appeals to some planners.

Some conservation groups have special interests in fighting the plans. The Audubon Society, for example, fears what might happen to wildlife if the dams reduce the flow of the Colorado and make it a trickling muddy stream in sections where it now flows with life and vigor.

FANTASY OF COLORS

I remember my last trip to the Canyon so clearly. I stood one day in the early morning light very near to a drop of 5,000 feet to the river floor below. A friendly little chipmunk tried to coax me closer to the edge, as I tried to focus him into the lens of my camera.

I went there in the early morning to take pictures of the Canyon. I remained till twilight, and snapped away with my camera as the sun swept over the Canyon from rim to rim creating everchanging colors of pastel blue, sun green, golden yellow—and then red and scarlet and russet browns toward evening.

TREMENDOUS SPEED

Over one million tourists visit the rim of the Canyon each year. A few of the more daring and hardy souls venture down the Bright Angel trail to spend one or two nights at the Phantom Ranch. They cross the one-mule suspension bridge, which is 60 feet above the roaring river.

You catch some idea of the speed of the moving water from the knowledge that the river drops 600 feet in its passage of 50 miles through the narrow gorge, or an average of 12 feet for every mile.

This drop and the speed of the flow enables the river to carry much of the debris gathered from the sides and slopes of the rock formations, and to carry it out to the tidewater in the Southwest. The Grand Canyon, more than 217 miles long, and from four to six miles wide, is in most places still unexplored territory. Many of the smaller canyons, capes and temples have never been reached.

No President has done so much as Theodore Roosevelt to preserve our natural wild heritage. In a speech at the Grand Canyon he said:

"Keep this great wonder as it is now—The ages have been at work on it, man can only mar it—We have gotten past the state when we are to be pardoned if we treat any part of our country as something to be skinned for two or three years for the use of the present generation."

These words were spoken quite a few years ago but they echo from canyon to canyon, gorge to gorge and should reach the hearts of all nature loving Americans on our Atlantic Seaboard who would save the Grand Canyon and the Colorado River from further destruction.

New Athens, Ill., Centennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1966

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday marked the beginning of the centennial celebration of New Athens, Ill. Located in St. Clair County in the 24th Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, New Athens prepared an outstanding 3-day commemoration of its 100th birthday.

The citizens of New Athens are proud of their town, and rightfully so, and scheduled numerous festivities for the occasion. New Athens boasts some of the finest farmland in the Midwest; its schools and churches are among the best, contributing to the well-being of the community, and its local industries have fine records and have contributed greatly to the town's progress and prosperity.

New Athens, originally known as Athens, also marks the spot of some of the initial construction and channelization work of the $77 million Kaskaskia navigation project. The residents of New Athens and their neighbors have worked long and hard on this project; it is fitting that this proud community of 1,923 should play such an important role in the development of the biggest navigation and flood control project in southern Illinois.

I salute New Athens and congratulate its fine people on their town's 100th birthday.

Jamestown, Ohio, Sesquicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, Jamestown, Ohio, located in Greene County in my congressional district celebrated its sesquicentennial from June 30 through July 4, 1966. It was my pleasure to participate in the "Veterans Day" observance of the sesquicentennial on July 2, and "Old Fashioned Day" on July 4.

The honored guests on "Veterans Day" were distinguished Jamestown native sons Maj. Gen. Clement F. St. John, M.D., U.S. Army, retired, now vice president of the University of Cincinnati, and Lt. Comdr. Vernon H. Fix, officer in charge of gunnery school, Great Lakes Naval Training Center. Also honored that day were Col. J. C. Wise, commander of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and Capt. C. J. Flessner, U.S. Navy liaison officer at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

On "Old Fashioned Day" Mr. Samuel A. Noblet of the Armco Steel Corp. made remarks citing the contribution to American industry of Jamestown native, George M. Verity, who was the founder of the Armco Steel Corp.

Under unanimous consent I am inserting the two speeches I prepared for "Veterans Day" and "Old Fashioned Day," as well as the remarks made by Mr. Noblet honoring George M. Verity:

JAMESTOWN, OHIO, SESQUICENTENNIAL "VETERAN'S DAY" JULY 2, 1966

Mayor Borst, distinguished guests, citizens of Jamestown, as a veteran of World War II and the Korean Conflict, it is a pleasure to be here to participate in the "Veterans Day" observance of the Jamestown Sesquicentennial, and to pay tribute to the men from Jamestown and the surrounding area who have participated in all the important wars in which this nation has been engaged since the Village was founded in 1816.

Jamestown men have served at Bull Run and Gettysburg, Manila Bay and San Juan Hill, in the Argonne Forest, the Coral Sea and Midway, Anzio, Heartbreak Ridge—and now we are adding the names of such places as Chu Lai, Pleiku, and Mekong Delta.

Last Wednesday on the Floor of the House the Armed Services Committee Chairman, MENDEL RIVERS, announced that there have been more than 24,000 casualties in Viet Nam, 4000 of whom are dead.

According to the casualty lists which I receive in my office every morning, I am happy to say that no Jamestown boys have been killed or wounded to date.

If anyone has information to the contrary, I would be grateful to have it, as I am keeping a record in my office of all Seventh District boys killed in the Viet Nam war.

I feel it is an honor and a privilege to share this platform with such distinguished veterans as Jamestown's General St. John, Colonel Wise and Captain Flessner. Their combat service and their decorations are so impressive that I feel like a Little Leaguer among Big League stars.

They can be justly proud, as well as their country, of their deeds of valor and their heroism in combat.

We also pay tribute to the some 400 veterans now estimated to live in the Jamestown area and extended our grateful thanks to them for the part they played in the cause of freedom.

Our thoughts today are also with the boys from the Jamestown area who are in Viet Nam, as their own thoughts must turn homeward on this 4th of July holiday.

As we pay tribute to the Jamestown veterans and servicemen here on this occasion, General Douglas MacArthur's tribute to the American fighting man in his farewell address to the cadets at the Military Academy at West Point on May 12, 1962, comes to my mind:

Duty, honor, country: those three hallowed words reverently dictate what you ought to be, what you can be, what you will be.

They are your rallying point to build courage, when courage seems to fail, to regain faith when there seems to be little cause for faith, to create hope when hope becomes forlorn. . . .

"The unbelievers will say they are but words, but a slogan, but a flamboyant phrase.

Every pedant, every demagogue, every cynic, every hypocrite, every troublemaker, and, I am sorry to say, some others of an entirely different character, will try to downgrade them, even to the extent of mockery and ridicule.

But these are some of the things they build. They build your basic character. They mold you for your future roles as the custodians of the nation's defense. They make you strong enough to know when you are weak, and brave enough to face yourself when you are afraid.

"In his speech General MacArthur also described the American fighting man:

"Their story is known to all of you. It is the story of the American man at arms. My estimate of him was formed on the battlefield many, many years ago and has never changed.

I regarded him then, as I regard him now, as one of the world's noblest figures; not only as one of the finest military characters, but also as one of the most stainless.

His name and fame are the birthright of every American citizen. In his youth and strength, his love and loyalty, he gave all that mortality can give.

He needs no eulogy from me, or from any other man. He has written his own history and written it in red on his enemy's breast.

"In twenty campaigns, on a hundred battlefields, around a thousand campfires, I have witnessed that enduring fortitude, that patriotic self-abnegation, and that invincible determination which have carved his stature in the hearts of his people.

"From one end of the world to the other, he has drained deep the chalice of courage. . . .

"I do not know the dignity of their birth, but I do know the glory of their death. They died unquestioning, uncomplaining, with faith in their hearts, and on their lips the hope that we would go on to victory.

"Always for them: Duty, honor, Country." . . .

JAMESTOWN, OHIO, SESQUICENTENNIAL, "OLD-FASHIONED DAY," JULY 4, 1966

As we celebate this "Old-Fashioned Day" at the Jamestown Sesquicentennial, and the 190th Anniversary of the founding of our country, it is fitting that we pause to consider some of the "old-fashioned" virtues—such as love and honor for our flag, loyalty, honesty, courage, thrift, duty, and patriotism—which made our country great.

I am reminded of an essay by an unknown author entitled "I am the Nation" which is hanging on the wall in my office in Washington.

I would like to paraphrase it just a little to make it even more meaningful for those of us gathered here today.

I AM THE NATION

I was born on July 4, 1776, and the Declaration of Independence is my birth certificate. The bloodlines of the world run in my veins, because I offered *freedom* to the oppressed. I am many things, and many people. I am the nation.

I am 195 million living souls—and the ghost of millions who have lived and died *for* me.

I am Nathan Hale and Paul Revere. I stood at Lexington and fired the shot heard around the world. I am Washington, Jefferson, and Patrick Henry. I am John Paul Jones, the Green Mountain Boys and Davy Crockett. I am Lee and Grant and Abe Lincoln.

I am Jamestown and her hardy pioneers who travelled over the Chiuxso (Shawnee) Trail from the Ohio River to the Mad River Valley.

I am the Browders, the Mendenhalls, the Moormans, the Strongs, the Watts, and the many others, who helped found Jamestown.

I remember the Alamo, the Maine, and Pearl Harbor. When freedom called I answered and *stayed* until it was over, over there. I left my heroic head in Flanders Fields, on the rocks of Corregidor, on the bleak slopes of Korea and in the steaming jungles of Viet-Nam.

I am the Brooklyn Bridge, the wheat lands of Kansas and the granite hills of Vermont. I am the coalfields of the Virginias and Pennsylvania, the fertile lands of the Ohio, the Golden Gate and the Grand Canyon. I am Independence Hall, the Monitor and the Merrimac.

I am big. I sprawl from the Atlantic to the Pacific . . . my arms reach out to embrace Alaska and Hawaii . . . 3 million square miles throbbing with industry. I am more than 5 million farms. I am forest, field, mountain, and desert. I am quiet villages—and cities that never sleep.

You can look at me and see Ben Franklin walking down the streets of Philadelphia with his breadloaf under his arm. You can see Betsy Ross with her needle. You can see the lights of Christmas, and hear the strains of "Auld Land Syne" as the calendar turns.

I am Babe Ruth and the World Series, and Gary Bradds and a basketball court. I am 130,000 schools and colleges, and 320,000 churches where my people worship God as they think best. I am a ballot dropped in a box, the roar of a crowd in a stadium and the voice of a choir in a cathedral. I am an editorial in a newspaper and a letter to a Congressman. I am Eli Whitney and Stephen Foster. I am Tom Edison, Albert Einstein and Billy Graham. I am Horace Greeley, Will Rogers, and the Wright brothers. I am George Washington Carver, Daniel Webster, and Albert Sabin.

I am Longfellow, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Walt Whitman and Tom Paine.

Yes, I am the nation, and these are the things that I am. I was conceived in freedom, and, God willing, in freedom I will spend the rest of my days.

May I possess always the integrity, the courage and the strength to keep myself unshackled, to remain a citadel of freedom and a beacon of hope to the world.

This is my wish, my goal, my prayer in this year of 1966—one hundred and ninety years after I was born.

ARMCO AND JAMESTOWN, JULY 4, 1966

(Remarks by Samuel A. Noblet, supervisor, community relations, Armco Steel Corp., Middletown, Ohio)

To all of you who remember the late Ole Nelson, I wish to bring greetings from his son Bob who is a member of Armco Public Relations.

I am delighted to be here in Jamestown this afternoon to share in the celebration of this historic occasion. I carry with me greetings and good wishes to you from our president, William Verity, grandson of our founder George M. Verity. I am also here today to say a few words about the relationship between Armco Steel Corporation and Jamestown which has been made possible through our founder George M. Verity.

It was here some 90 years ago that the roots of Armco actually began to form. From this early beginning there is today an Armco that is the sixth largest company in the steel industry. The company has steelmaking plants not only in the state of Ohio, but also in Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania and Texas. Then too, there are the three divisions, Armco Metal Products, National Supply and Armco International. Armco Metal Products largely serves the construction industry and has a steel building plant right next door—Washington Court House. National Supply serves the petroleum industry world-wide. And Armco International is our overseas arm covering the free world.

This broad expanse, briefly described, represents a capital investment of well over a billion dollars and employment for 40,000 men and women.

Let me now turn to the real heart of Armco; the roots right here in Jamestown which helped to give birth to Armco Steel Corporation. These roots I speak of are the warm friendly relationships which Armco management work so hard to maintain among its employees, customers, shareholders and neighbors. These roots of understanding and cooperation began with the philosophy of our founder, George M. Verity, the man who spent his early formative years here on Verity Street, Jamestown.

At age 14 Armco's founder spent his summer with his father, a Methodist minister, in the harvest field on the nearby farm of Reverend James W. Smith, who was the great grandfather of Mrs. Leland Smith. It was here where father and son learned greater understanding and appreciation for each other. You know full well that work on the farm also is a good way to learn how to keep digging when times get hard.

Such experiences as these help to lay the true foundation for George M. Verity's philosophy in human relations. This philosophy helped to nurture the early days of Armco and later made it possible for George M. Verity to establish Armco Policies. I am happy to say they are still our guide today. In brief Armco Policies stand for: Faith in Men; A square deal always; A True Spirit of Co-operation; Pride in accomplishment; Proper incentives to work; Best possible compensation; Opportunity for advancement; Good living conditions; Fair treatment of customers and highest business ethics.

No doubt this same creed based on Christian principles has been applied by all of you in your business operations.

Our president, William Verity, just recently published objectives for the company. Here is what one of them has to say:

"To do business guided and governed by the highest standards of personal conduct and ethics, with Armco Policies as a constant guide."

To me, Armco Policies, an expression of George M. Verity's philosophy, had a great deal to do with the fact that the Middletown Works of Armco Steel Corporation, which now has over 7,000 employees, has never experienced a strike.

Your gift to Armco Steel Corporation includes not only a founder whose son became executive vice president before retirement and whose grandson is now our president, but, it also includes for Armco a way of life born from the philosophy of George M. Verity who once lived on Verity Street, Jamestown.

On behalf of myself and the 40,000 men and women of Armco, we say thanks to you good people of Jamestown for the contribution you have made to Armco and we wish you well on this historic occasion.

Greatest Living Virginian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I insert an editorial that appeared in the Danville Register, published at Danville, Va., in my congressional district, on July 14 and which I should like especially to bring to the attention of our colleagues.

It was entitled "The Greatest Living Virginian" and concerns my distinguished colleague from that State and my longtime friend, the Honorable Howard W. Smith.

In the many years I have known him, I have come to look upon this gentleman as an able and most valuable friend, as well as the very embodiment of statesmanship. He represents the finest and best that there is in our State and in the Nation. He deserves to rank, as he no doubt does, with the greatest Virginians of all time who have represented our Commonwealth in either branch of the Congress, or who have been connected with Government in any way. Here is a man who has never surrendered principle for expediency.

The editorial is as follows:

THE GREATEST LIVING VIRGINIAN

When outstanding men find in one another the qualities of greatness, one may be assured they are not concerning themselves with an average, run-of-the-mine person and that agreement or disagreement has little to do with the evaluation, which is, essentially, an appraisal of character, manner and capability.

Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr., who knew personally every Virginia figure of the Twentieth Century, and some of the Nineteenth, often remarked privately and, occasionally, publicly, that Howard Worth Smith was "the greatest living Virginian."

That was high praise from Harry Flood Byrd who, himself, probably has been for many years considered by Americans and foreign citizens the greatest living Virginian. Passing this honor to his longtime friend and colleague was characteristic of the elder Byrd.

Now that the people of the Eighth District have written an end to the Congressional career of Judge Smith after 19 terms, his closest adversaries in the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives are acknowledging that his defeat is a "terrible loss" to the whole House, and to the country. It surely is.

Liberal, Great Society Democrats such as George Rawlings are a dime a dozen in the House; there is but one Judge Smith. And all too soon there will be none.

The greatness of Judge Smith was not dependent upon his seniority in the House, although he was fifth among his peers in that respect. His greatness was in the man himself as a splendid human being, as a man of convictions who stood by them and worked for them in the belief that he was serving best the people of his district, of his state, and of his nation in so doing.

His like may not be seen again soon in Washington when the Judge returns to his farm at Broad Run, or to his home in Alexandria, where he long headed a large bank and presided as a circuit judge. He still has his interest in banking and enough properties to keep him busy.

But he will miss and the Congress will miss him most when the Rules Committee goes about its scheduling measures to reach the floor. The zest of competition, the clash of strategies will be absent. A stalwart committee that under Smith's chairmanship took its work seriously and made its weight felt will be reduced to a docile chart-keeping for the House Majority—opening and closing doors on bills as the Speaker may suggest.

It was never that way when Judge Smith was in the chair.

Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, on the Fourth of July, celebrations of our national independence and individual freedom echo throughout the land. We are proud of our democratic heritage in as far as Americans may pursue distinctive courses in politics, economics, and religion. The American way of life is characterized by personal liberty. We have consistently sympathized with freedom movements throughout the world as a free America would find it hard to survive in a world dominated by communism. For the fourth time in the last five decades the United States is engaged in a battle to contain menacing imperialism. But, while our attention is focused on southeast Asia let us not forget the plight of the hundreds of millions of peoples living behind the Iron Curtain.

Americans are apt to take their freedom for granted. We unconsciously enjoy our individual liberties. Disagreement and criticism in politics, a profession of one's own choosing, and religious worship based on individual beliefs have become so essential to every American that they are pursued without second thought. Captive Nations Week must serve as a time when the American people will consider their fortunate position, and, at the same time, rededicate themselves to the peoples living under the oppressive rule of the Communists.

As the world continues to divide itself into camps of haves and have-nots, we cannot afford to lose sight of our responsibilities. As the leader in the free world we must continue our policy of building bridges to the East. The peoples behind the Iron Curtain must be aware of our sincere concern for their plight. The flame of liberty still burns in the hearts of those peoples subjugated by the Communists. We as a nation must at all times be willing to rekindle that flame.

Will the Real Secretary Freeman Stand Up—Please?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rolla Clymer, editor and publisher of the El Dorado, Kans., Times for more than half a century has been affectionately known to his readers and the people of Kansas as "Sage of the Flint Hills" because of his geniune talent for puncturing egos. I trust my colleagues as well as Secretary Freeman will take notice of his trenchant ratiocination in the following editorial on July 9, 1966:

"FAVOR" WITH A STINGER

His Lordship, the High Cockalorum of Agriculture, with power of life and death over the downtrodden masses of farmers—the Hon. Orville S. Freeman—has graciously notified the Kansas governor that 35 drought-stricken Kansas counties have been granted the satrap's kindly permission to harvest hay or grass livestock on land retired from production under the federal farm program.

Butler county is one of the 35 fortified with this boon.

With a little hay or grazing to be had from various tracts on a farmer's place, now taken out of production, available for use of a few head of cattle in a strict emergency, it would seem this should be a normal move. The generous "favor" might have been granted without restriction but, in the government's usual obtuse fashion a payback for this relief has been demanded.

His Majesty (Hon. Freeman again) said permission for grazing and harvesting of hay upon the diverted areas is dependent upon agreement by a farmer to pay, reliquish or refund payments, otherwise earned for retiring the land to the equivalent of the fair value of the vegetation to be grazed or hayed.

In other words, if the grass now growing on restricted acreage is allowed to wither and die, so mote be. But if it is employed to save a few cows from starvation in a period when rain simply will not fall, its value will have to be paid back through a juggling of some of the intricacies of the sacred farm program.

This instance is much akin to firemen telling a man they will save his daughter from the raging flames, provided he will mortgage the homestead in return from that favor.

In most cases, your distraught farmer will take the hay—and to heck with the rest of it. Yet the overlords of the Great Society administration mutter in their beer while wondering why the farmers do not rise up and call them blessed.

University of California, Irvine, May Offer Clinic to Sick Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I was privileged to speak out on the floor of this House about the tremendous positive contributions made to the State of California and this Nation by one of the world's greatest universities, the University of California. At that time, in addition to the record of excellence of the entire university, I focused on the growing greatness of the brandnew campus at Irvine, in Orange County. Truly, the seeds have there been planted for the university of the future. As I previously reported, the Irvine campus is headed by a dynamic group of educational leaders unafraid to experiment and innovate to meet the needs of the university and the community which it serves.

An article in the July 4 issue of the Los Angeles Times recently brought to my attention well illustrates the point. Entitled "UC Irvine May Offer Clinic for Sick Firms." The article describes the imaginative proposals of Dean Richard C. Snyder, head of the graduate school of administration at Irvine, to render our Orange County community a double service: First, of course, by training of students for managerial positions in industry, government, and education; and, second, by making available the knowledge and information which the university has at its command through advice and consulation to businesses, schools or even government agencies with administrative and organization problems.

The article goes on to outline the 20th century concepts underlying the school of administration as developed by its imaginative dean.

Mr. Speaker, this article well illustrates how this brandnew university is already becoming encrusted with tradition—the tradition of innovation and experimentation in service and education.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the article into the RECORD and urge my colleagues to read it:

DEAN ENVISIONS DIAGNOSIS: UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT IRVINE MAY OFFER CLINIC FOR SICK FIRMS

(By William Trombley)

IRVINE.—A California businessman whose company is "sick" may soon be able to bring his troubles to the University of California, Irvine, for diagnosis and treatment.

As part of the Graduate School of Administration on this new UC campus, Dean Richard C. Snyder has proposed a "clinic," described by the dean as "a permanent, continuing diagnostic and treatment center for social organizational problems."

A business executive, a school superintendent or the manager of a local War on Poverty program could bring his problem to the UCI clinic, where faculty experts would study the problem and suggest a remedy.

SPECIAL KNOWLEDGE AVAILABLE

Dean Snyder thinks the clinic would be good for managers because it would enable them to "tap on a regular basis the special knowledge of our research people."

And it would be good for students in the Graduate School of Administration because "they could witness the proceedings in the same way medical students witness an operation."

Snyder envisions an arrangement that would permit students to observe these discussions of organizational malaise and turmoil through one-way windows "so they can see and hear, yet not intrude."

Dean Snyder also thinks the "clinic" approach might help to clear up some of the confusion about outside consulting work done by university faculty members.

He would charge a set fee for the clinics services, and the money would go to the School of Administration, not to the professors.

However, to make this work, faculty salaries might have to be as high as they are for professors of surgery in medical schools—in the range of $30,000 to $40,000. Whether UC could, or should, pay its professors of administration that much money is a real question, Snyder admits.

But he argues, "This is a way for the university intellectual community to provide service, a better way than the present system of random consultation for fees."

"We have to make it clear that the university is not at everybody's beck and call," the dean said. "Other people do some things better than we do. What the university can offer is new knowledge and information, but this must be done without prostitution."

Dean Snyder continued: "What should a university do and what should it not do? This is muddy and complex . . . nobody's got it down on paper yet. But I think the clinic idea, where services are performed for a set, pre-determined fee, might help."

SERVED NORTHWESTERN

The clinic for organizational illness is only one of the ambitious ideas the 49-year-old Snyder brought to Irvine from his former post as chairman of the political science department at Northwestern University.

He would like to use rapidly growing Orange County as a "field laboratory for the study of social change." Researchers would gather information about population, land use, resource allocation and the county's economic structure, with the thought that this data would provide both fascinating research material for the faculty and useful information for the county.

The Graduate School of Administration will open in the fall, with a handful of faculty members and students for a "guinea pig year," as Snyder called it, during which some of the dean's ideas will be tested.

The school's assignment is unusual. It is not a school of "business administration," but a graduate program in which administration of education and government, as well as of business and industry, will be studied.

The first year of the two-year program leading to a master's degree will be devoted to making the student a generalist, the second to preparing him for specialization, Dean Snyder said.

First-year students will take a course, in the form of a series of seminars, called "Foundations of Administration." Here they will learn elements of mathematics, computer science and psychology that Snyder believes all administrators should know.

It is hoped that the computer course will prepare future managers to avoid both "ignorance of computers" and "the phony fadism that says, 'the computer solves all'," Snyder said.

First-year students also will undertake "the internal study of organizations and the relationship of organizations with their environments," Snyder stated.

In these seminars, the dean said, "we hope to get a return to some old-fashioned notions of integrity. For instance, we will try to find out what is a Hippocratic oath for a manager, for an organizer of working units? Does he have a responsibility beyond his immediate task? We think he does and that this is sometimes forgotten."

In the second year (and in subsequent years for Ph.D. seekers) students will turn from general principles to specific applications. Not too specific, however, for Dean Snyder pointed out, "all we can do is slow down the inevitable obsolescence . . . our big hope is that we will turn out people who are good self-teachers."

HANDICAPS USEFUL?

The Irvine Graduate School of Administration will be much more closely related to the social sciences and to psychology than are most educational programs in administration.

Psychology will be important because "we want to be really serious about individual human differences," said Snyder. "We want to find out more about the invisible handicaps people have, or think they have, and teach them to harness these handicaps and use them as skills."

"We want to get at the problem of organizational dry rot," the dean continued. "We want administrators to learn to encourage people who ask funny questions, who look at things upside down. In general, organizations tend to ignore innovative people."

Snyder hopes to invite working administrators to the campus for short visits "to tell the students and the faculty what the hell it was like yesterday." He would like to establish "a dialogue between the guy who has a problem and somebody who has read a book about the problem."

CHANGE ANTICIPATED

Many universities now invite prominent managers for lectures or brief visits but Snyder has observed, "They usually try to act like academics—they lecture and everybody else listens. There's no give-and-take."

Instead, he would like to create "a safe place where a manager can be open about his problems."

One of the areas Snyder hopes his school will explore is the administration of higher education, where little research has been done, despite its increasing complexity. "It is amazing that we arrive at the year 1966 with so few people who know anything about the administration of higher education," he said.

Perhaps the University of California, presently suffering severe bureaucratic pains as it attempts to decentralize its administration, will be one of the first patients in Dr. Snyder's clinic.

A Disaster, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, while Florida and the Nation suffer from the continuing airline strike, there is hardly a word of encouragement from the Government negotiators. It is difficult to understand how this situation can be permitted to continue.

Florida press reaction has been virtually unanimous, and indicates the costly effect of the strike on the Florida economy. I ask that the editorials from the Fort Lauderdale News, Miami Herald, and the Tampa Tribune be printed at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Fort Lauderdale News and Sun-Sentinel, July 9, 1966]

GREATER GOVERNMENT ROLE NEEDED WHEN STRIKERS IGNORE PUBLIC INTERESTS

Our modern civilized society becomes increasingly complex, year by year. Each of us becomes more and more dependent on services of various kinds for health, comfort, in fact even for the necessities of life. Without these services our life is seriously disrupted, our economy suffers severe setbacks, health, even our very existence, may be threatened.

The days of self-sufficiency ended when our nation became urban instead of rural.

A century ago a family living on a farm could provide for itself through its labor. It was able to produce its own food, clothing and shelter, and need look to the efforts of others for only luxuries, or perhaps medical care. That day has vanished and we now depend on the efforts of others to insure our needs for food, clothing and shelter will be met.

We have long recognized this dependence on services through powers we have granted our governments. These powers include regulation of operation of utilities providing vital services. We insist, through law, that utilities maintain service. We require them to obtain approval of a regulatory board, whether it be the Interstate Commerce Commission, a state board, or even a municipal body, before discontinuing service to an area. We regulate the rates they may charge and the return they may earn on investment.

All of this is done on the principle it is the duty of government to protect the public interest, to take action to protect the public welfare; on the principle that the public good is paramount to the rights of property ownership and use. As a result, there have been only a few instances of capricious suspension of service by a utility or service type of corporation.

Interruptions of service, except those due to natural disaster, such as flood or storm, have been the result of labor disputes. Perhaps the most blatant in years; the most callous flaunting of the public good was the strike on the New York Subway system several months ago. In that instance, the Transport Workers Union and their leader, the late Mike Quill, paid no attention to the public interst and rode roughshod over courts and elected officials.

The current airline strike has halted a transportation service which is vital to the public good, and necessary in the public interest. Suspension of service has disrupted the transportation of the mails and of air freight cargoes. It has caused a dislocation of the current of our life.

Since we insist the utility and transport firms maintain service, unless granted approval by a regulatory body to suspend operations, should we also not require that vital transportation services remain in operation during the course of a labor dispute? Since we regulate the rates and return of the companies, requiring charges to be set by regulatory bodies and on presentation of evidence in support of a requested increase, may this same principle not apply to wage contracts as well?

In these days government has set guidelines on price increases for manufactured products and has taken swift action to roll back price hikes which are in excess of these guidelines. The guidelines are supposed to apply to wages, as well, the government said.

The airlines have offered a raise of 30 cents an hour. That is $12 more for a 40-hour week, or a pay raise of $624 a year. A government fact-finding board recommended 42 cents an hour, over three years. That is $16.80 more for a 40-hour week, or $873.60 increase for a year. The mechanics have asked 52 cents an hour more, which is $21.20 more for a 40-hour week, an increase of $1,102.40 per year. The present base pay for the mechanics is $3.52 per hour, $140.80 for a 40-hour week, $7,321.60 per year.

We wouldn't attempt to say who is right on the matter of pay scales. Our point is that the general public is being ignored in the matter. The public interest, the public good, the public welfare must be protected.

Continued interruptions of services vital to our national life will bring demands from the public for compulsory and binding arbitration of labor disputes in certain fields, such as utilities and transport.

The public interest is also at stake, and that stake is much greater and more vital than that of either the airlines or the mechanics.

JOHN C. GERARD.

[From the Miami Herald, July 13, 1966]

A DISASTER, MR. PRESIDENT

The airline strike, an intolerable act in itself, is fast becoming a national disaster.

Thousands of additional employees have had to be furloughed by the five struck airlines.

More than 150,000 travelers and 4,100 flights a day have been grounded; 70 cities have no air service of any kind.

Air express piles up; air mail has been curtailed 70 per cent.

The money costs, which are not recoverable, are running into the millions of dollars.

And the whole thing in effect is a strike by the machinists and their associated maintenance workers against the United States government.

Before the walkout, all issues were threshed out before an emergency mediation board appointed by President Johnson.

It is a fact that the union rejected the board's proposed settlement, which went even beyond what the airlines offered but nevertheless agreed to.

Hear this:

"The recommendations of the mediation board offered a fair and reasonable framework within which the parties should come to an agreement between themselves for a final settlement of their dispute . . . This union cannot justify holding a strike gun at the head of its government."

This is not the statement of a labor-baiter but of one who is hardly an unfriend of the organized working-man. It is the statement of Sen. WAYNE MORSE of Oregon, chairman of the Presidential board.

We apprehend that the effects of the strike will grow much worse with each passing day.

The Railway Labor Act, which covers airline disputes, clearly is unworkable. Indeed, its antiquated machinery has failed in more than one railroad dispute, including the Florida East Coast case.

Thus the situation calls for stern measures in the national interest.

We urge President Johnson to intervene directly and personally and with all dispatch. He alone may be able to persuade an irresponsible union leadership that it is trifling with the welfare and security of the country.

Efficient air transportation is the life stream of a complex industrial society and the life line to the Viet Nam war front. It is being struck to death.

[From the Tampa Tribune, July 12, 1966]

THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL

For no good reason, thousands of Americans are being forced to cancel or change travel plans and mail deliveries and express shipments are being delayed.

The strike of the machinists' union against five major airlines affects 60 per cent of the nation's passenger traffic—amounting to about 150,000 travelers a day—and 70 percent of the airmail volume.

This constitutes a national inconvenience and, in many individual cases, a physical or financial hardship.

There's no justification for hitting those innocent bystanders with the machinist's wrench.

The National Mediation Board had proposed that the dispute be settled by binding arbitration. The union refused. A three-man Presidential Emergency Board then studied the points of disagreement and made recommendations for a compromise settlement. The airlines said the recommendations constituted the basis for agreement but the union rejected them.

Members of the Emergency Board denounced the strike as "unnecessary and unjustified"—a judgment in which air travelers would certainly concur.

Under the old contract, airline mechanics received a top rate of $3.52 an hour. The union wants an increase of 52 cents an hour, plus provisions for cost-of-living raise and liberalized vacation and welfare benefits. The airlines originally offered a 30-cent raise, but upped it to 48 cents.

It does not appear that the airlines are being niggardly in their attitude; it seems instead, that the union is making excessive demands.

But the merits of the dispute over pay and vacations are not really a matter for the public to judge or with which the public ought to be concerned.

The public interest is in having available the transportation service which has been duly licensed to serve the public.

If service can be shut down whenever a union chooses to exercise that power as a means of enforcing wage demands, then the public interest is sacrificed to profit a *private* interest.

Five airlines are grounded now. All commercial airliners could be forced down by strike action.

We do not believe that any service so importantly affecting public convenience and necessity should be subject to shutdown by either management or labor.

Binding arbitration ought to be required in disputes involving public transportation. This step, admittedly, runs counter to the principle of free collective bargaining. But carriers operate under government franchise and government regulation of prices, so they are outside the free-market area occupied by ordinary business enterprises.

Congress has the power to preserve the public's right to uninterrupted public transportation. It will do so only when it fears the wrath of stranded travelers more than it does the political muscle of the striking unions.

Address of FDIC Chairman Kenneth A. Randall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on June 10 I was privileged to attend the annual meeting of the District of Columbia Bankers Association, and to hear a very thoughtful address by Mr. Kenneth A. Randall, Chairman of the Board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Mr. Randall, a native of Utah, is presently a constituent of mine, residing in Montgomery County, Md. A graduate of Brigham Young University and the Stonier School of Banking, he came to the FDIC on March 10, 1964, for a 6-year term, and was elected Chairman of the Board on April 21, 1965.

In his speech, Mr. Randall reviewed many of the problems facing the banking industry in this period of economic and financial strains. While asserting the desirability of moving toward a freer financial market in the long run, he recognized and reemphasized the short-run need for flexible and enlightened regulation to "maintain confidence in a system that is basically sound."

I am pleased to bring Chairman Randall's perceptive analysis to the attention of Congress:

Address of Kenneth A. Randall, Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

Mr. Randall. I feel constrained that after Mr. Mathias' very excellent discourse on the problems of regulation and business that I should present a few credentials, Mr. Mathias, if I may.

I think it may be well to start our recognizing that I live in Montgomery County, so ably represented by Mr. Mathias, that I also am a Republican. I am the only Republican head of a regulatory agency in Washington at the present time, which gives me a rather peculiar perspective. So that I may add credence to this, I think back to the time when I was in school and my best friend and his family, and my family, were the only two families in the school that supported Alf Landon.

[Laughter.]

I am going to talk to you about regulation and why it is necessary today. It may seem contrast to the remarks that Mr. Mathias made, but I would ask your indulgence with a bit of perspective.

We have two problems. One is short run, and one is long run. I do embrace the philosophies that Mr. Mathias so ably put to you, that the objectives should be for freedom—freedom of the market place. Freedom as much as possible to allow management to make the necessary adjustments; freedom to perform business as it should be performed in this country.

I also ask you to realize that there are short-term realities. In banking, particularly, we must recognize those realities, and they are that this industry has been built for 150 years on the concept of regulation. Regulation does exist in the industry. It has existed since the days of free banking, prior to the Civil War, and we have found, periodically, that due to the very peculiar nature of banking, there must be some method of arbitrarily taking some postures.

This isn't just the nature of banking per se, but the nature of American banking. No other society has ever created a banking structure such as we have, with 14,500 banking units operating across this broad country. It is unique. It is different. In that setting, we have found, periodically, and at points of crisis, that regulation has become necessary and we must also remember one thing—that we always live in the short run. Sometimes items have to be done, positions have to be taken, that are part of living in the short run.

Again, may I emphasize that I share, and endorse, Mr. Mathias' viewpoints and I believe he will have sympathy with some of the things I would like to discuss with you today.

I want to share with you, if I may, some problems that have been giving me gray hairs and stomach aches over the last few weeks. They surround themselves with some of the dialogue that has been going on in Congress, and in another chamber, mostly in the House Banking and Currency Committee.

This dialogue started around concern in this country about the phenomenal growth of the deposit instrument—the negotiable certificate. We have problems in this arena, even defining the question, let alone trying to find answers, but I believe as we go through the interchanges between witnesses and Mr. Patman, and his colleagues of this Committee, that we are at least finding out that certificates of deposit are not the problem, but what we are involved in today in this short run is the adjustment to a major change in interest rates.

If I may go back with you a moment, to look at where we were at the end of World War II, the banks of this country came out at the end of World War II, with excess liquidity by any historic standard. They had not had the ability to loan during the war, the growth of money supply had piled up in the banks, and the banks were well able to take care of all the credit demands that were placed before them with moderate growth in deposits.

The specialized institutions, the mutual savings banks and the savings and loan associations, were able to aggressively attract funds from the market to finance a booming housing industry.

What happened out of this? We had a major growth in—of the specialty interest, the special financial savings associations and we have created a new and a very large market. We must look at it, I believe, today as a whole. We have $140 billion in share accounts in savings and loans in this country. We have another $60 billion in deposits in the mutual savings banks of this country, or $200 billion in the specialized industry. We have another $380 billion in the banks of the country.

We have found, I am certain, that we can no longer separate these institutions, in our view. We must look at both sides of this coin. It is a coin, and an adverse factor in any segment of major proportions can be adverse, and will be adverse to all sectors of this arena.

Let me exclude from our discussion this morning, some special problems that have been well articulated by Mr. John Horn, that exist in the savings and loan industry. I am excluding those, and I would ask you to confine thinking in this arena to the economic problems that exist in this special industry.

But the position today of all financial intermediaries must be your concern, and mine, and the country's. What, then, is the problem as we look at this, how can we define the question in order to hopefully find some answers?

May I ask you to look with me at one dimension, and one of the peculiarities of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is that it wears several hats, and in the insurance depositor position, we have the Federal regulatory responsibility for the mutual savings banks, which are banks of deposits, although, structurally much closer to the savings and loan industry. They are conservative institutions. They have played the ballgame according to legitimate lines of endeavor. They have played it along your lines of endeavor, and your rules.

These savings banks are primarily located in the Northeast part of the country, 60 percent of their dollar volume is in New York. They have an average portfolio yield in the New York area of 5.44 percent. They are competing in a market where the yield has painfully, I think, to many of you, gone from 4, 4½ up to now 5¼ and 5½ percent interest. These are institutions that to operate need a quarter of a point. In order to become competitive in a market that exists in New York City, the mutual savings banks, because they are excluded from the use by statute of the special instruments of CD's, must raise the weight—the whole weight—of structure in their bank, the whole interest rate structure, in order to be able to operate profitably and soundly.

In a period of growth, to adjust a rate change in a mutual, due to the specialized nature of their assets, takes from six to eight years to raise, say, a point in their interest yield of portfolio. In a period of net outflow, which they are experiencing at the present time, not just a decline in a rate of growth, but in net outflow, where the amortized liquidity that is built into their portfolio is used for withdrawal, adjustment is impossible.

This problem exists not only in the mutual savings banks in New York, it also parallels another geographic area in the savings and loan industry. Primarily Southern California, Nevada, Arizona and New Mexico. These two problems have major impact in our economy. They cannot be ignored in this short term period of adjustment that we are in.

Let's go back again with some of the great wisdom that hindsight gives us. This is the great factor that we all have, as we look at a problem like today. I think we would all agree that the market has moved far faster than any of us anticipated. This market moved with such astounding speed that the action of the Fed last December in moving the ceiling on "Q" to 5½—the perspective of this is almost unbelievable. The Fed, in their statements at that time, said that they felt some minor adjustments needed to be made in the market, that the money center banks were buffeting against the celing at 4½, and the movement to 5½, which would be effectively a stand-by movement, would allow them some leeway to make minor adjustments.

The minor adjustments consisted of a major jump of one percent in less than six months.

I have to look back and be honest with my view at that period of time—I can stand here and be scholarly and say, "They made the wrong decision, they should have done it otherwise". I was even more liberal at that time. I was arguing with the Fed that they should move the ceiling to 8 or 10 percent and establish a ceiling, at that point so that would be effectively a stand-by.

In the light of what has happened today, I wonder how far it would have gone, when one has to look back with conscience and wonder whether or not any view would have brought sanity at that point of time.

But what has happened? We have approaching, serious problems in specialized financial industry. We have approaching serious problems in smaller banks across the country, in the adjustments, and competition, and disciplines of a market under pressure.

This is the setting. Now we have to look at, "What do we do?" Apparently, something needs to be done, and, again, in the short run.

A few weeks ago, Secretary Fowler proposed a differentiation in the market, cutting CD's by size, and cutting them off at $10,000, so that we would have a free market—reasonably free—after 5½ above the 10,000 cut-off, and a lower rate of interest under ten and a lower rate of interest on savings passbooks as presently exist.

We were concerned about this 10,000 cut-off. We did a sampling of banks that we were currently examining across the country. We found that in smaller banks between 20 and 28 percent of their time deposits were at—right at—a $10,000 denomination.

This is a recognition that many have split and spread at the deposit insurance level. We felt that if we pursued the philosophy that Mr. Fowler had explored and pointed out that at $10,000, we would precipitate another crisis. Move the thrust of the problem from the specialized financial institutions right into the small banks, for we believe that if this $10,000 cut-off that we found in banks, is as important as it is, that people would combine their balances to move for higher rate and this would make a major shift in flow of funds from small banks to large, and in effect, get the smaller banks in this country.

We tried to find answers, we kept looking. A week ago, before Mr. PATMAN, I proposed the same philosophy that Mr. Fowler used, but with a cut-off of $100,000. This is not due to any great wisdom, but we did base our decisions on some observations in the market, and, hopefully, they are realistic.

These observations brought us to the conclusion that we believe that there are probably two savings markets that we deal with. One, for lack of a better term, we might call the "domestic personal savings area"—the people that save liquid cash balances for needs, that after a certain point in time and in size, they invest their money into other parts of the financial market and no longer keep personal monies just in savings accounts or in time deposits.

Second, we have a large market of temporarily idle corporate funds and the international market, where it is so important to be competitive in order to preserve some sanity in balance of payments systems.

Treasury informs us that they must have at least a market of 5½ percent to be competitive with foreign countries. This was the point where we felt that perhaps we could argue that the $100,000 cut-off made some sense, that the personal deposits tended to level out, or the personal holdings in cash tended to level out some place between $25,000 and $100,000. We felt, first of all, and a place to start, that the $100,000 cut-off would have less adverse effect in the market. We did not propose it as a cure-all, a panacea, we proposed it only as a possibility to stem some of the adverse problems that were approaching us rapidly, in effect, to buy time, to allow for adjustments in the market place that finally must resolve themselves in a free market.

There is another point in the testimony that I made and it was a plea for flexibility, and for a single or coordinated authority. One of the problems we have, at the present time, in FDIC, in regulation, is that we have a parallel control of interest ceilings with the Federal Reserve, called Regulation 329. We have responsibility to enact this regulation over the state insured, non-member banks of this country, but we have no authority to put it into place.

We believe that, finally, one party, either the central bank or a coordinating committee of some type must have the responsibility and the authority to have the regulations that may be necessary.

We made our plea, first of all, for flexibility. We believe that if we have learned anything from the action of the Fed in December of 1965, we have learned that the problems increase in intensity from an arbitrary ruling made, or taken, in the market place, that any arbitrary act has unforeseen consequences, any arbitrary act for imposed ceilings is going to cause problems where we have not known them before.

A proposal, such as currently exist in the Congress to impose across the board a flat rate of 4½ percent could be chaotic if someone does not have the authority later on, to make second, third, fourth generation decisions and adjustments to smooth out the impact of this kind of regulating action.

We also know that we cannot avoid the disciplines of a free market by any type of regulation. Yesterday, a Fannie Mae issue was put out, expected to yield an average return of 5.7 percent. If the ceiling is moved down away from the disciplines of this market, it will not solve the problems of the savings and loans, the mutual savings banks or the commercial banks. It will result only in the flow of funds from the financial intermediaries to the open markets.

These are the disciplines. Again, the only answer in this period is one of flexibility.

I have no love for controls, nor am I trying to sell controls to you today, nor do I have any love for an allocated market. The fact remains that we are on the hook of a controlled market with portfolios held artificially low from World War II to the present time.

To get way from this period of time, it is going to take the best capacities and the best thinking that we have to avoid painful and serious consequences. Right now, we are in the period of strong withdrawal symptoms.

The the world of reality, the only sane method is to provide some method for less rapid adjustment, than we are seeing, and we have seen, within the last six months. To me, this can only come about with the use of flexible controls in the hands of a regulator who will allow for movement to the free market the long-run objectives without tearing at the fabric in the intervening period of time.

This is the only answer that regulatory agencies, as representatives of responsible Government, can provide. We must provide, I believe, at this time, for methods of orderly adjustment. These can only be created by flexible tools and possible regulation across the board.

That means not just banks under ceilings and under regulatory controls, but mutual savings banks, savings and loans, and possibly insurance companies under the same type of regulatory factor.

We must move to a free market. I have no question about that. But we must also be concerned with the fact that above all, we must maintain confidence in a system that is basically sound and find the methods that the regulatory agencies can use to maintain that confidence.

I am certain, that even without new tools, all of the agencies are going to use every facility, at their command, to maintain confidence in the system. This will be done with some tools of flexibility. It may be less painful.

I presume what I am saying today is that we have some problems and we do live in the short run and the adjustment is painful and difficult. I think I am also trying to say "thanks" to you for allowing me the luxury, momentarily, of unburdening my mind. This has some therapy, also.

We live in difficult times.

Thank you.

James Drought's Letter to Harry Gilroy, of New York Times, Carries Insult to Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring my colleagues' attention to the rather unfortunate terminology used by the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities in describing publications totally or in part financed by an author. The descriptive term used by the Foundation is "vanity." Is it appropriate or right to imply that a man is vain if he contributes to the publication of his own work? I think the term lends only injury to the promotion of the arts in America—the raison d'etre of the National Foundation.

Insult is added to injury by another revelation in Mr. James Drought's letter to Mr. Harry Gilroy, of the New York Times. This time the insult is directed to the Members of Congress. Chairman Roger L. Stevens' special assistant, Frank Crowther, has been reported as saying that being recommended to the Foundation for a writer's grant by a local Representative is not only not helpful "but may hinder chances that a writer will be considered."

Dr. Drought's letter follows:

SKYLIGHT PRESS, INC.,
Norwalk, Conn., July 4, 1966.

MR. HARRY GILROY,
The New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR HARRY: I hope you will consider the following newsworthy, because I believe it has far-reaching healthy ramifications for the entire book industry in this country.

As you know, after publishing eight books of mine in 3½ years, Skylight is having difficulty raising the capital necessary to complete the Drugoth trilogy by publishing the final two novels in it which would be my ninth and tenth books. Most all of our capital must come out of profits, and although we have been extraordinarily successful in the marketplace—selling nearly 550,000 copies of my first seven works, and garnering a great deal of world-wide acclaim and recognition—our costs have been considerable since we were forced to establish a new company, a new author and new titles on almost no capital to start.

We attempted to make public to our many friends and devoted readers that we would have to deny them the opportunity to purchase Drugoth II. We released this information and even took advertisements to get the message across to them. Since then many possibilities for financing the considerable cost of completing the trilogy have been advocated.

Senator RIBICOFF, Senator DODD and even Senator PROXMIRE (who chairs the Senate sub-committee on Small Business) attempted to help us get a Small Business Loan for the purpose of producing the trilogy. However, their endorsements turned out to be ineffective because of a qualifying clause in the legislation which denies Small Business Loans to "businesses engaged in publishing books, magazines and/or newspapers".

Naturally, we tried all available methods of enlisting private capital and bank-capital. I believe the controversial nature of the previous books closed this channel.

Recently our local Congressman, DONALD IRWIN, submitted my name for one of the writer's grants from the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. He thought this might provide, at least, the capital necessary for finishing the writing of the trilogy and thus help make the publishing of it possible.

Although we assumed that I was eligible, Lorna found out very recently that being recommended by the local Representative is not only not helpful "but may hinder chances that a writer will be considered," or so reported the Deputy Chairman of the National Foundation, a Mr. Crowther. He said that most of the awardees would be chosen by the National Institute of Arts and Letters. Since I have not been asked to be a member of this private organization I assumed to would have little sympathy for my need or my project. Mr. Crowther also informed us, however, that Carolyn Kizer who works directly for the Foundation as "Director for Literary Programs" is supervising the applications for grants and screening worthy artists and projects for consideration.

I wrote a brief note to Miss Kizer, telling her I wanted to complete the Drugoth trilogy. I enclosed copies of my first seven books, as well as a copy of the eighth, which as you know is Drugoth I, the first book in the trilogy. I included some of the favorable world-wide critical response to this book hoping that it might suggest a necessity for the trilogy to be completed.

This weekend I received a note from Miss Kizer, enclosing an application blank and instruction forms on how to complete it.

On page 2 of the instruction booklet I found the following:

"Writers should provide a bibliography of published work (although in the case of prolific and frequently-published authors, the bibliography may be limited to five short stories, five long or ten brief poems, and five to ten essays or reviews. List *all* book publications.) 'Vanity' publications (those for which the author has paid all, or part, of the expense of publication) must be listed as such."

As you know, my first two books, "The Secret" and "Mover," were published entirely at my personal expense, and their original sale was the very thing which provided the capital that Skylight Press Inc. was formed on. Since then, whatever capital Skylight has operated on has come from profits, a small bank loan for which I personally had to be the co-signer, and any funds that I could return into the business from the royalties and salary that it paid me. I think of the manner in which I have published my work as almost exactly similar to the method of operation which in drama, phonograph records, and now movies is described as "Independent Production."

Yet, I find that in order to fill out my application and become eligible for a writer's grant from this national foundation (which gets its funds from the broad taxation base that I am part of) I must ascribe a descriptive term to my books, 'Vanity', which brands me with a motive that I find despicable. (In any court of law the use of the term "Vanity" in relation to a piece of work would be grounds for libel action on the part of the producer, because if his production is public then anyone who ascribes the term "Vanity" to it is attributing private motive for a public act and to do this is illegal and damaging.)

Therefore, I find I have my choice: 1) libel myself and fill out the application; or 2) deny myself as a writer any possibility for being eligible for a grant, the funds of which I help to create by paying taxes on the very royalties that these books have earned me!

I refuse to chose between these two alternatives. Both of them seem equally unjust to me.

Instead I am considering protesting the despicable, illegal, and damaging stipulating for application. I happen to think that small independent firms like mine should be favored rather than discriminated against in regard to their writers being eligible to receive national grants. If my work were published by a large and powerful corporation, operating off a large capital base, I believe I should be entitled to advancements for completing any work my publisher wishes to publish. The very fact that *I* personally financed the independent vehicle that publishes me should entitle me perhaps more so than any other writer to look to this tax-supported source for help.

It seems that my protest can take only two shapes. 1) Public denouncement of the Foundation, its program for literary grants to writers, and its rationale for best selecting worthy projects, because it obviously favors those writers whose work is published by large corporations and discriminates against "Independents." 2) Refusal to pay my personal income taxes, rather than subsidize a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities which discriminates against me as an "Independent Book Publisher" and author.

I believe it only remains for me to say that no work of mine would have been published in the past, the present, or in the forseeable future by any large established corporate publisher, and had I not been willing to be personally responsible for creating my own publishing vehicle none of my work would be public today. (We have files and files full of letters to substantiate this from every large corporate publisher turning down our requests for publication of my work, for distribution help, etc.)

Also, it seems to me, that the critical commentary the work has garnered, upon being made public by me, as well as the 550,000 in sales, indicates that at least very many people believe that my efforts through Skylight were worthwhile.

It is important to me that my view be made public. I think my readers deserve to know why I refuse to avail myself of this possibility for providing them with the completed trilogy, and I think I deserve the right to protect myself from this kind of discrimination which I can combat only by making my charge public. I think also that the many "Independent Publishers" springing up across the country deserve to be appraised of the situation by exposure to my view. Of course, I also believe that any decent newspaperman should be a little bit outraged that a writer should be forced to ascribe a motive of "Vanity" to his efforts just because he finances the production of his work.

I know one thing: if Mr. Arthur Hays Sulzberger really believes all those things he told my graduating class from Knox College in 1956, Galesburg, Illinois, then he will want his newspaper to report my view of this matter as thoroughly and objectively as possible.

Cordially,

JAMES DROUGHT.

Rees Supports Amendment To Restrict Foreign Aid to United Arab Republic

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

I firmly believe that economic assistance should be withheld from countries which persist in policies of belligerence and in preparation for their execution.

The proposed amendment to the foreign aid bill will make the policy of Congress clear concerning the bellicose attitude of General Nasser and the United Arab Republic toward the establishment of peace and stability in the Middle East.

The intent of the amendment proposed by the gentlemen from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN and Mr. HALPERN] is clear to all of us:

> No assistance shall be furnished under this act to the United Arab Republic unless the President finds and reports within 30 days of

such findings to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House that such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States, and further that such assistance will neither directly or indirectly assist in aggressive actions by the United Arab Republic.

Our foreign aid program should be for those countries believing in peace—those which are concerned with the peaceful development of their economies.

Unfortunately the more than $1 billion of aid we have given the United Arab Republic since the commencement of our aid program has done little to promote the peaceful intentions of this country. Today the United Arab Republic has over 60,000 troops in the country of Yemen actually engaging in a civil war, while refusing to deal with the situation in a peaceful manner. The United Arab Republic has continually goaded the Arab extremists to war against the State of Israel and has led the escalation of the Middle East arms race. The United Arab Republic has for 18 years done everything possible to prevent a reasonable solution to the sad plight of the Arab refugees.

I am afraid that much of the impact of our aid these past years has been to free United Arab Republic funds for the purchase of more and more Soviet arms.

Mr. Chairman, only last month the House adopted an amendment to the food-for-freedom bill to prevent food sales to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that such sales are in the national interest. The amendment to the foreign aid bill now before us will be consistent with the House's previous action.

In conclusion, may I say that our policy should not only affect the aggressive actions of Nasser and the United Arab Republic, but all nations receiving aid who would use this aid in perpetrating militant acts against their neighbors.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Higher Education for Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, legislation establishing a system of higher education for the District of Columbia, is now pending before both the House and the Senate. The following article by Dr. Carl Bode of the University of Maryland discusses this very important issue:

A GREAT UNIVERSITY THAT NEVER WAS

(By Carl Bode)

Today each of the great capitals of the world, from Moscow to Tokyo, has a great university. Except Washington.

It isn't as if the problems before us don't grow more massive, more formidable every day. Our attitude may have been appropriate during the pastoral age of our Republic, say in the Presidency of Jefferson, but it seems a little unrealistic now. And yet the efforts to provide a first-class university for the District of Columbia have been nothing but dismal failures.

Instead of one great university we have five middling ones. Each has its areas of strength; each has some eminent man on its faculty. But it is no service to gloss over the truth, and the truth was reaffirmed a few weeks ago when Allen Carter published *An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education*. He polled professors over the country to find out how they rated American universities at the graduate level. The verdict on our local institutions was deeply disappointing. I should add that my own university in the Maryland suburbs, failed to fare much better.

As I see it, from a worm's-eye view, the blame lies in two places. It falls, first, on the leadership of the local universities. The boards that appoint the presidents have long been the essence of mediocrity and they have chosen presidents in their own image. An academic statesman would have made them feel uncomfortable; a visionary would have made them nervous. If somewhere in the history of higher education there has been a great president or two—and I know that aroused alumni will remind us about them—they linger only as names over ivy-covered entrances.

For the strongest as well as the weakest of them faltered before the profound indifference of the citizens of Washington. The brute fact is that even now the people who manage the District and the people who live in the District do not prize higher education enough to fight for it. On them the bulk of the blame must fall. At this moment Congress is shrugging off a bill to start a four-year college. At this moment the civil-rights groups are laboring and picketing for other things. Education is still an orphan.

I am afraid it will continue to be, and I have history on my side. As far back as 160 years ago, in the time of Jefferson as it happens, a notable proposal for a great university was laid before the Congress and the people. They ignored it, as they ignored its successors. But for those who value education the original proposal has a certain melancholy interest, and so I give its highlights.

The ideas come from Joel Barlow, a writer and diplomat of the early Republic, in the shape of a *Prospectus of a National Institution*. Many of his suggestions are still sensible. He saw the chief jobs of a Federal university as teaching and research (he even used the word *research*). The curriculum would include moral, political and scientific studies—fit subjects for the new Nation. It would include some study of the fine arts, which Barlow defended against the puritan charge that they led to degeneracy.

To manage the university there would be a board of 15 trustees and a chancellor, all appointed by the President of the United States. Attached to the university would be a university press. There would be laboratories, libraries and gardens for botanical and agricultural experiments. The two service academies and a museum might also be attached.

Even now the prospect can kindle the imagination. Imagine a splendid campus, with much of the scientific research done today in the Federal Government brought together in its halls. Imagine the Library of Congress, the Smithsonian, and the National Gallery all on the same stately quadrangle and all related through the common aim of illuminating and enobling the mind. Imagine West Point and the Naval Academy humanized by being in a notable center for humane studies.

The money for the Federal university, Barlow believed, would come from private citizens and from the Government. It would surely be provided because the need was so plain. As he said, the people are our masters; "They must be instructed in their work." He felt certain that the time was ripe. "The project," he announced, "is brought forward at a happy moment." That was in 1806. Jefferson himself once observed that it took time to persuade the people to do even what was for their own good. But 160 years?

Fort Sheridan Bids Col. Ben Chapla Farewell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Col. Benjamin C. Chapla, commanding officer at Fort Sheridan, Ill., for the past 4 years, is leaving this post on July 28 to become deputy post commander at Carlisle Barracks, Pa.

A graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1929, Colonel Chapla distinguished himself as an Infantry battalion commander during World War II, taking part in five combat campaigns including the Normandy and Brest Peninsula engagements in France, the Ardennes breakthrough in Luxembourg, and the Hurtgens Forest assault in Germany. He had become executive officer of the 28th Infantry, 8th Infantry Division, at the time our troops made contact with the Russian forces north of Berlin, where the Germans surrendered. Colonel Chapla also served in South Korea and in many other posts.

In addition to his career as a combat officer, Colonel Chapla served during 1952 as a professor of military science and tactics at St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn. Later he was assigned to the Pentagon as executive secretary in the Secretariat of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, where he was in charge of career planning in the Army.

Colonel Chapla's military service has been recognized by the award of many honors and citations. He was decorated three times for bravery in combat and, in addition, received the French Croix de Guerre avec Etoile. As a result of his service in the Korean conflict he was decorated by the Korean Minister of Defense with the Ulchi Medal with Silver Star.

Mr. Speaker, I have observed conditions at Fort Sheridan since Colonel Chapla assumed his command there in 1962. During this period I have noted the excellent care given to the physical surroundings at Fort Sheridan, as well as to the high morale of the military and civilian personnel at this historic Army post. Fort Sheridan celebrated its 75th anniversary last year. At about the same time the Department of Defense, with the approval of this Congress, authorized a transfer of the 5th Army Headquarters from the south side of Chicago to Fort Sheridan. The able assistance provided to the Department of Defense and to the committees of the Congress, as well as the reputation of Fort Sheridan under Colonel Chapla's command, contributed substantially to this result.

The officers and men at Fort Sheridan have come to admire and respect this courageous infantryman and able administrator. In addition, the citizens of the surrounding and nearby civilian communities have developed an affection for Colonel and Mrs. Chapla which will endure long after their departure from Fort Sheridan.

Many friends of Colonel Chapla, including an outstanding group of governmental, military, civic, and business leaders, will be joining together to pay tribute to him on July 26. Under the general chairmanship of Mr. Arsene J. Denoyer and representatives of the Waukegan-North Chicago Chamber of Commerce, the military liaison committee of the Association of the U.S. Army, Lt. Gen. Joseph A. Teece, retired, and many other residents of the 12th Illinois Congressional District will gather at 6:30 p.m. at the Glen Flora Country Club, Waukegan, Ill., on Tuesday, July 26, at a reception and dinner honoring this outstanding man of the Army.

I am proud to include Colonel Chapla as one of my good friends, Mr. Speaker. I take this occasion to express to him my appreciation for a job well done at Fort Sheridan and to convey to him and his wife, Opal, my wishes for a pleasant and successful tour of duty at his new post in the War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pa.

Remarks of Congressman Fogarty at the Catholic Hospital Association Annual Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY, CATHOLIC HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONVENTION, CLEVELAND, OHIO, JUNE 16, 1966

I am happy to be here today with so many of the members, friends, and well-wishers of the Catholic Hospital Association. I welcomed Father Flanagan's invitation to talk briefly with you about civic and political climates, the necessity for social legislation, and the potential impact of some of that legislation on basic values and its relationship to the provision of health services in a pluralistic society. I welcomed his invitation because I am convinced that the Association and its member hospitals must seek an increasingly important role in providing health care under the changing philosophies that have surfaced in recent and pending legislation.

As you know, your representatives in Washington are doing their utmost to obtain the widest cooperation of our public and private forces in remolding the health aspects of our society. In the process, important questions are raised and important decisions must be made at many levels.

As one of the forces whose support must be marshaled in this effort, the Catholic Hospital Association represents one of these levels. When an organization of this nature meets in plenary session, major questions of public as well as of internal policy come under the gavel and controversy abounds in the give-and-take of discussion. Under our democratic system, this is as it should be and an entirely healthy situation.

When Father Flanagan invited me to participate in your 1966 convention, he was kind enough to send me an information copy of your planned program. As I read it over, your choice of "Commitment to Values" as the convention's theme struck me as both happy and logical.

It is a happy choice because the Hospital Apostolate is firmly rooted in commitment to values, practical as well as religious and humanitarian, values whose dimensions grow ever larger as your hospitals assume greater responsibilities.

It is a logical choice because it brings to a focal point a quality that has characterized the Association from its very beginning. As evidence I might cite:

Father Moulinier's initial commitment to hospital standardization and his later concept of educational commitment;

Father Schwitella's commitment to the voluntary hospital;

Monsignor Griffin's commitment to emphasis on the human side of the hospital;

Monsignor McGowan's commitment to community involvement; and

Father Flanagan's commitment to determine the role of the Catholic hospital in a society that grows more complex day by day.

I was also pleased to learn of the Monsignor McGowan Memorial Address, which will be delivered later today.

Monsignor D. A. McGowan, or "Father Luke," as he was affectionately known to most of us, was a close friend of mine for many years. His personal attributes and everything his life stood for have already made him a candidate for unofficial canonization by those of us who knew him well. But we have been unable to find a "devil's advocate."

There is no need to list Father Luke's achievements for this audience. When Cardinal Cushing preached at Father Luke's silver jubilee as a priest in 1959, he declared that the monsignor's "accomplishments are too numerous to mention." I will abide by Cardinal Cushing's judgment.

I recall Father Luke's significant contribution to the Catholic Hospital Association's publication, "A Voluntary Approach to a National Health Program," written in conjunction with Monsignors John O'Grady and George Louis Smith. When it appeared in 1949 this document presented a "positive statement of Catholic social principles concerning the individual, the state, society and the place of government in relation to the health care" of people. By providing a crystal-clear statement of Catholic thought on current health proposals it brought those concepts back into the mainstream of contemporary health philosophy. In addition, it spared no words in pointing out certain obligations under the principles of social justice first expressed by Pope Leo XIII.

Father Luke had a compassion for all humanity that enabled him to find something likeable and admirable in everyone he met. And, no matter their differences, no one who met Monsignor McGowan could fail to react to him.

None of us who knew this wonderful priest will ever forget him; now that he is forever on the side of the angels, the Monsignor McGowan Address will serve as a fitting memorial to Father Luke.

In my 25 years in the House of Representatives, I have been exposed to a variety of civic climates. If I can indulge in a bit of oversimplification, some were hot enough to establish the validity of President Truman's famous remark about ". . . getting out of the kitchen." Others were sufficiently frigid to banish certain proposed legislation to a permanent deepfreeze. But, in any case, their influence is undeniable.

It is important to recognize that civic climate arises from the manifold changes that occur in the socio-economic-political conditions present during a given period of time in our country—changes which affect any consideration of our nation's health needs. Today's civic climate involves such variables as population explosion and population shifts, urbanization and ex-urbanization, the breathtaking explosion of knowledge triggered by scientific and technological advances, automation and its implications, and changing patterns in age groups, with increasing numbers of very young and very old people.

As a result of the pressure of these factors, the focus of health services has changed. As communicable diseases decrease, prime attention is paid to chronic diseases. And, in addition to insisting upon stronger preventive health programs, our people want protection from an environment that is being increasingly contaminated with disease-producing substances.

In brief, we have witnessed in this country since World War II the birth and coming to maturity of a national philosophy of health, expounded by an increasingly health-conscious and increasingly sophisticated citizenry. Our citizens have come to recognize the need for comprehensive personal and environmental health services, and they have acquired the means toward realization by a favorable combination of social, economic, and political events.

Now, while Mark Twain is quoted as saying that nobody ever did anything about the weather, the same statement does not hold true with reference to "climate," civic or political. Let me give a few examples from history—incidentally, two of them were physicians, and both of them were significantly able to alter the "climate" of their times.

Consider Dr. Thomas Wakley, an English physician of a century ago. Here was a man who was certainly outside the Establishment as it then existed—yet, because his livelihood was threatened by the conservative "climate" of the College of Royal Physicians in London, he entered politics and was elected to Parliament. During his career, his legislative efforts won him much prestige, but he remained proudest of his "Bill for Registration of Qualified Practitioners . . ." which led to the passage of the Bill of 1858, the present legal basis for English medical practice.

Consider Rudolf Virchow. This young pathologist, even before banishment from Berlin and subsequent fame in Wurzburg, dared to challenge the "climate" of the Prussian government for what he termed "centuries of neglect and corruption which were the foundation for the poverty and ignorance of the people." Virchow's efforts were instrumental in bringing about the Revolution of 1848, in which he was a leading figure. Despite the fact that the government was overthrown, Virchow realized—and persisted in stating—that the Revolution was "essentially social." An objective appraisal will substantiate his claim.

But let us move closer to home—right here to Ohio in our own time. I have in mind the case of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults. This national organization came into existence because one man, Mr. Edgar F. Allen of Elyria, Ohio, was shocked by his son's tragic death and distressed by the pitiful inadequacy of our knowledge about and facilities for the care of crippled youngsters. Through his personal dedication and effort, Mr. Allen created a civic climate that was favorable to crippled children. That climate spread from his own community of Elyria to cover the state of Ohio, and ultimately it blanketed the entire nation.

The Catholic Hospital Association's own history indicates no lack of ability to recognize climate, and to do something about it by winning friends and influencing people—and legislation. When certain by-products of the flood of legislation that appeared during the great depression posed a threat to the voluntary hospitals of America, these institutions signaled their common interests by establishing a Joint Committee to represent them in hearings on Federal legislation dealing with health and hospitals. With Father Schwitella as its spokesman, the Joint Committee achieved outstanding results:

It won exemption for voluntary hospitals from the National Reconstruction Administration Code and a proposed excise tax on voluntaries.

It secured Federal help for payment for care of the medically indigent for voluntaries without sacrifice of their autonomy.

It "insisted upon the philosophical and ethical implications of the indigent patient," calling these people wards of society rather than of government.

It fostered the idea and ideal of cooperation and partnership, rather than competition, between private and public health agencies.

In this regard, who has not heard the story—perhaps more than once—of President Roosevelt's famous letter to the Catholic Hospital Association on the occasion of its Silver Jubilee, wherein he assured the Association of his appreciation of the work for the nation accomplished by the private institutions and particularly by the sister's hospitals, and further described that work as ". . . for him the chief argument for the maintenance of public and private institutions which is so characteristically American in pattern."

But perhaps the best example of the necessity for hospital people to involve themselves in influencing legislation, and an indication of the results that can be achieved by meaningful involvement, is found in the story of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946, more familiarly known as the Hill-Burton Act:

It marked the first time that consideration was given to a measure providing for both tax-supported and voluntary hospitals;

It marked the first time that safeguards were provided for the rights of individual institutions in a sizable statewide program; and,

Most significant of all, it marked the first time that a bill had been initiated, developed, and perfected by the hospital associations of America acting in concert.

These are only a few examples, but I believe they waive necessity for further proof of the desirability for understanding and helping to form—and thereby to influence—civic climate; and the desirability for influencing—and thereby helping to form—legislation.

The development of legislation is a legitimate concern of any citizen or group of citizens in America. Laws are made to answer needs and, since no lawmaker can be aware at one and the same time of all the needs of his own constituency, or his own geographical area, or the nation, there is a requirement that these needs be known. It would be difficult to find a Senator or a Congressman who has not benefited from a few spoken words, or a letter, or as a result of a visit from citizen's groups or organizational committees. All of these agencies are able, in their own way, to offer convincing arguments for the need of a particular piece of legislation, and this is a legitimate use of personal or group influence.

In the face of the problems inherent in the mass of recently-enacted health legislation and of that yet to come, it is easy to understand the concern of those responsible for the management of our Catholic hospitals. Central to that concern is the necessity to maintain present values so that the principles for which the Catholic hospital stands will not be sacrificed.

I share the commitment of the Hospital Apostolate to those values, but I certainly can offer no panacea, nor would I, realizing that for some time your best minds and deepest thinkers have focused considerable energy on the problems involved.

While there is no disposition here to attempt to illuminate even a single facet of one problem, I do believe that an article I read in a fairly recent issue of your publication, "Hospital Progress," provides a starting point for the accommodation that must be made. This thoughtful article pointed out that "We have entered an era of new relations between the Church and the world . . . with new organizations, new institutions, new fields of action with their new dimensions . . . [that] have brought about new roles for the clergy, bishops, religious, laity and the whole Church."

The accommodation between Church and world initiated by the recent Ecumenical Council is swiftly being reflected by the actions of its leaders and agencies. This suggests to me that it is time for our Catholic hospitals to take a hard and realistic look at the future and what it may bring.

There will be . . . there can be . . . no impact on that future without planning. Some nameless genius has epitomized this by saying that we must do more than improvise plans for the future—we must begin to plan our very improvisations. It is obvious to the discerning eye that unless more of our Catholic hospitals move from calm waters directly into the mainstream of hospital affairs, they will be forced to react to situations and circumstances not of their own choosing, and this is disastrous in strategic planning.

If Father Luke were here with us today, I am confident that he would transmit the same message—those Catholic hospitals not presently engaged in community dialogue and community services must become engaged, and those who are already involved must expand the dimensions of that involvement.

What I am trying to say is that even as each generation is born and passes away, it leaves an inevitable legacy—Change. The face of the hospital apostolate itself is changing to reflect the presence and pressures of socioeconomic factors almost unknown only a few years ago. As a result, the activities and functions of our religious men and women are reflecting a similar change.

Of course, we know that it will always remain the "Apostolate of Competency" of which Father Flanagan so often speaks.

The Catholic Hospital Association has met here this week to focus attention on the many problems facing our Catholic hospitals and to establish a means of operation that will guard against any lessening of basic values as it moves toward their solution. When I meet our religious people today, I sense that they have the same qualities that motivated religious men and women in ancient times to minister to the sick and needy, and I have complete faith in their ability to cope with the complex health picture of tomorrow—and to do so with none of our basic values diminished.

We cannot resolve the unresolvable, but with a full measure of dedication, selflessness, and patience, plus vigorous and imaginative pursuit of our goals, we can fashion the instrumentation—human and administrative—to win through to those goals. The real threat may well come from those who view the need for adjustment as someone else's struggle.

I believe that our denominational hospitals have a great service to render in tomorrow's health panorama. Come what may, I can visualize no circumstances that will deny the need for the particular zeal demonstrated by our religious people in medical service. And the other tangibles the Catholic hospital provides its patients in meeting the continuing health needs of modern society help to provide a balance in our pluralistic society—the same kind of balance the government recognized so many years ago when it entered its first cooperative agreement with the voluntary hospitals.

Perhaps I could best advise you in whatever efforts you see fit to make with regard to legislation deriving from the civic climate of today by repeating the oft-spoken injunction of Father Moulinier, the Association's "Founding Father." Father Moulinier's counsel was to "Find the facts—filter the facts—fix the facts—and face the facts fearlessly." Fifty years of Association experience indicate that action taken after following that formula has rarely, if ever, failed to be appropriate.

Meanwhile, your organization is performing an outstanding service by stimulating among our people an understanding of the processes and problems inherent in our free society and its government; by encouraging more active participation and appearing in the van of that movement at practical levels; and by advancing the art of involvement, thereby aiding the public—and Congress, as its representative—in meeting the many problems confronting us in the health field.

Only with the help of organizations such as yours and the assistance of public-minded citizens in every walk of life can we continue to ferret out and do something about this nation's health needs and aspirations. Given that kind of help, your Congress can move to the fulfillment of one of its own commitments, its determination to make the Great Society a means to a full life for all of our citizens.

Arnold Toynbee, in his special "Study of History," has asserted that "The twentieth century will be chiefly remembered not as an age of political conflicts or technical inventions, but as an age in which human society dared to think of the welfare of the whole human race as a practical objective." I believe the Catholic Hospital Association has many contributions to make toward that objective, and I wish you Godspeed in their accomplishment.

Captive Nations Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join today in marking Captive Nations Day as a part of the observance of Captive Nations Week from July 17 through July 23.

Liberty is our dearest possession in the United States. It is a condition of life we seek not for ourselves alone but for all men, everywhere. It is important, therefore, that we remind ourselves today of the peoples of Europe and Asia living in bondage and of their aspirations to become free to choose their own destinies.

Although the Western nations have granted independence and freedom to more than 50 nations since World War II, the Soviet Union has not only retained its 19th century empire in the east and south but extended its sway to the west, encompassing the ancient and proud nations of eastern and middle Europe.

These peoples' resistance to subjugation has expressed itself again and again—in the East German revolt of 1953, in the Polish stirrings of 1956, in the great Hungarian uprising of 1956, and in the individual decisions of some 4 million East Germans to seek freedom in the West.

Tyranny takes many forms. To continue to work for liberty from within the modern totalitarian states requires a rare courage and tenacity. It is fitting, therefore, that this eighth Captive Nations Day takes place on the 22d anniversary of a grasp for freedom by men with just such qualities. On July 20, 1944, the men of the German resistance carried out their plan to rid Germany and the world of Hitler and Hitlerism—and only the most bitter misfortune prevented their success.

To all those who have given their lives for freedom in middle and eastern Europe, we in the West and their countrymen owe a great debt of gratitude. They have helped to keep alive the flame of liberty that Nazi and Communist governments worked to snuff out.

For ourselves, we must pursue policies that aid the countries of middle and eastern Europe in their efforts to achieve greater independence from the Soviet Union. We must encourage the tendencies toward economic liberalization that have already begun. We must, despite the conflict in Asia, go one to build the bridges to Eastern Europe that offer the best hope of an expansion of individual freedom for the captive peoples.

Who Is Responsible for Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of June 25–26, 1966, entitled "Big Brother the Villain" is to be commended for laying the blame for the recent inflation at the administration's door. When the Federal Government runs a cash deficit which actually increases from $1.5 billion in the third quarter of 1965 to $4.2 billion in the first quarter of this year, there can be no doubt about this administration's responsibility for the price increases. In a pattern that has become all too familiar, the administration through its "voluntary" guidelines tried to blame the private sector for responding to the forces of excess demand set loose by its own fiscal policy. If editorials like this one get the wider circulation they deserve, an informed public will see and condemn this administration's economic wheeling and dealing. With this hope in mind, I insert the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

INFLATION STILL GNAWS THE ECONOMY: BIG BROTHER THE VILLAIN

Commerce Secretary John T. Connor revealed this week he has sent letters to more than 26,000 of the nation's corporation heads, urging them to "exercise reasoned restraint in purchasing, inventories, pricing and in deferring capital expenditures wherever possible."

He is worried about more inflation. He should be. But as usual an Administration spokesman seeks to thrust onus of the price-spiraling battle upon industry.

Meanwhile, Big Brother in Washington keeps merrily on his way with bust-budget spending.

The real villain in the play of inflation is Federal Government—both the Administration and Congress. Their idea of political economy, especially in an election year, is to spend politically and prodigally. That is what they are doing.

With feints at piddling economies, like curtailing school lunch programs and snapping off White House lights, the Administration has asked $121,900,000,000 in new spending power. Congress is raising this deficit ante promiscuously.

According to Republican Congressman TOM CURTIS of Missouri, new money authority rolling through Congress will be added to a carryover of $114,700,000,000 spending power already in the pipelines.

The vast majority of this federal expenditure has nothing to do with the Vietnam war, sometimes used as an excuse for lavish costs of federalia.

Mr. Connor said it would be a "serious" mistake to consider the present slow-down in the feverish rate of advance earlier during 1966 "is a forerunner of recession." In this judgment, we believe the Secretary quite right.

The demand for new cars has shrunk somewhat, probably only for a short time. Home building has dropped from its peak. Borrowing is a bit more difficult. There is some restraint on expansion of business investment. The mortgage market is a bit tougher.

But such indices can be ephemeral and quickly vanish. Last week retail sales rose 7 percent above a year ago. Bank business loans were up this week. Steel's second quarter earnings were notably better than the first quarter, though not as good as the second quarter of 1965. Car loadings last week were 3.5 per cent up from '65. Living costs are mounting. The job market is tighter than for years, with millions more at work and thousands of jobs begging for takers.

No, there is no immediate prospect of a recession. But unless the inflation trend is battened down, there will come a recession. Inevitably.

And the easy, often mentioned panacea—new federal taxes—is no cure-all for inflation despite all the pontificating talk of the New Economists.

It is true that another cost-siphoning will result from the Vietnam war. But the major expansion of government spending has been for domestic purposes—well intended, often desirable, but heavily studded with waste, boondoggling, bureaucratic duplication and politics—almost always politics.

If President Johnson really wants to curb inflation's rapacity, he must set a brake on the hand-over-first disbursement of federal moneys for every kind of social nostrum he can dream up.

The best way to block runaway inflation, the only effective way, is to balance the national budget and keep it balanced. This despite the drain of the costly Viet issue.

It's no good merely to preach curbs upon business, a ploy that in effect points to the inflation ogre and tells American industry, "let's you and him fight." Big Brother must practice what he preaches.

Is this likely for LBJ? It certainly is not in line with his paternalism theories or his conduct. Yet if he doesn't make the Administration show the way in clamping a lid on profligate spending, he is asking for drastic inflation and a resultant crushing recession.

Simplification of Laws of Farm Credit Administration—S. 2822

SPEECH
OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has explained the purpose of this bill very well. There is no reason for me to repeat that.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit and by the Full Committee on Agriculture. I urge that the rules be suspended and that the bill be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now such time as he may consume to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE].

Airman Luther M. Bailey and Capt. Thomas A. Murphy—A Special Kind of Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GALE SCHISLER

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker during my recent inspection tour of Vietnam, I was extremely impressed by the dedication of our servicemen to the conduct of the war against the Vietcong. Equally impressive was the devotion of the servicemen who have voluntarily taken on an additional war—the war to alleviate the suffering and deprivation of the civilian population of South Vietnam.

Aside from their duties on the battlefield, many of our military personnel have been constructing village homes, water systems, and schools. Many others are teaching children and adults. In these and many other ways, military personnel throughout Vietnam are demonstrating a special kind of heroism. Their actions are all the more meaningful because their involvement with the Vietnamese people comes willingly, unpretentiously, without expectation of reward.

A1/c. Luther M. Bailey, son of Mr. Hano Bailey, Jr., East Moline, Ill., in my district, won the confidence and love of children in South Vietnam's central highlands while his detachment was constructing a spillway for a water reservoir in the village of Plei Piom. Airman Bailey began teaching the children games, simple mathematics, reading, and science. The spillway has been completed and the detachment has moved on, but Airman Bailey continues to visit the children of Plei Piom. Along with this speech, I am inserting a headline article from the Moline, Ill., Daily Dispatch recounting Airman Bailey's work with the Vietnamese children. The Dispatch article is reprinted from the 7th Air Force News published in Vietnam.

In many instances, a serviceman's aid to civilians involves whole communities in the United States. Capt. Thomas A. Murphy, an officer from Kewanee, Ill., in my district, began teaching English to the faculty of a Vietnamese technical high school. When Captain Murphy became aware of the need for a dormitory at the Vietnamese school, he wrote to his mother, a teacher at Wethersfield

High School in Kewanee. Mrs. Murphy passed on her son's letter to WHS President Joseph Winek and the students. The students wanted to help Captain Murphy with his project for the Vietnamese boys and, through their own donations, raised $100 which the captain used to purchase lumber for construction of the dormitory.

The heartwarming story of Captain Murphy's contribution and the contributions of the students of Wethersfield High School is told in an article by Annette Murnan in the Kewanee Star Courier which I am inserting in the RECORD along with my remarks.

I am extremely proud of Airman Bailey, Captain Murphy, and the Wethersfield students. Anyone who doubts that our real purpose in Vietnam is to secure for the South Vietnamese people the peace and progress of which the enemy would deprive them, need only read these articles. Of our servicemen, we expect dedication to the task on the battlefield. That so many servicemen are equally devoted to aiding and comforting the civilian population of South Vietnam gives us extra reason to be proud.

[From the Moline (Ill.) Daily Dispatch]

EAST MOLINE AIRMAN IS "PIED PIPER OF PLEI PIOM"

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following story, concerning Airman Luther M. Bailey of East Moline, is reprinted from the Seventh Air Force News, published in Viet Nam. Bailey has been dubbed the "Pied Piper of Plei Piom" as a result of his work there with Vietnamese children. Airman Bailey is a son of Hano Bailey Jr., 1516 9th Ave., East Moline. He was graduated from United Township High School in 1960 and before enlisting in the Air Force in 1961, he attended Black Hawk College and was employed by Fresh Pak Candy Co., Moline. He has been in Viet Nam since last Thanksgiving Day.)

PLEIKU.—"Bay lee, Bay lee," scream the small children as they run toward the Air Force vehicle at the Montagnard hamlet of Plei Piom in Viet Nam's central highlands.

Cause of the excitement is Airman 1.C. Luther M. Bailey of East Moline, the "Pied Piper of Plei Piom," who uses games to teach children who have never been to school.

Airman Bailey, a military policeman at Pleiku Air Force Base, first became acquainted with the villagers through a project of his unit—Detachment 10 of the 619th Tactical Control Squadron.

Detachment men supervised and assisted the Montagnards in construction of a spillway for the village water reservoir.

Noticing the children watching from a distance while the work was going on, Bailey decided to see if he could become acquainted with them.

His first attempts to make them come nearer were met with shy refusal, but with a little whistling mimicry and general clowning he brought them closer.

By the time the spillway was completed, Airman Bailey and the youngsters were fast friends. He had them involved in play periods, while he acted as leader. The play periods led to school classes.

Most of the detachment men seldom come to Plei Piom now. They are helping construct a spillway for another village. But Airman Bailey is still a regular visitor.

The children eagerly gather around him when he arrives. He supervises games of leap frog, tag, one-legged and relay races or whatever strikes his fancy.

"Of course, I bring the girls into the fun, too," he explains, "with our quieter sessions of counting, reciting the alphabet or identifying trees and flowers." When the boys are engaged in the rougher games, the girls cheer from the sidelines.

"I split the children into competing groups in the teaching classes, with about 20 on a side. They give me numbers or names in English and then laugh at my feeble efforts to speak Vietnamese," he says.

About 40 or 50 children are usually present for Airman Bailey's supervised play and school classes. Some of the children are as old as 17, but most of them are much younger. Since they receive no formal schooling, the classes are new and exciting to them.

The airman's past experience has helped prepare him for his role as a teacher. While stationed with the Air Force in Germany from 1961 to 1964, he worked with the American Youth Alliance coaching a fifth and sixth grade basketball team, a Babe Ruth baseball team and a trampoline class of boys and girls from 9 to 18.

"Of course, it's a little harder where there is a language barrier," he says of his work with the Vietnamese children, but he admits "the feeling of satisfaction is also greater."

On a recent visit to the village, Airman Bailey encountered a small problem when the children spotted a 5-foot-long cobra lying across a tree's roots in the play area.

After obtaining the village chief's permission, he and another member of his detachment shot the snake as the children stood at a safe distance with their fingers in their ears.

This made the "Pied Piper" even more of a hero than ever to the young people of Plei Piom.

[From the Kewanee (Ill.) Star-Courier, June 11, 1966]

STUDENTS SHARE, EARN FUNDS FOR VIETNAMESE

(By Annette Murnan)

Captain Thomas A. Murphy, a Kewanee officer in Viet Nam, touched by the effect of the misfortunes of war on young Vietnamese boys, has helped the students of Wethersfield High School to accomplish an investment in the future that they and the Vietnamese will not soon forget.

Through their concerted efforts and self-imposed economies, and not with donations solicited at home, the WHS students in the past semester gathered and sent the captain $100. The money will be used for lumber to build a dormitory for homeless Vietnamese boys who seek an education at the Technical High School in Qui Nhon in the central highlands of Viet Nam.

The dormitory will make it possible for 30 or 40 boys—among the 400 students who have been separated from their families by the vagaries of war to live in quarters other than the classrooms. The classrooms have been serving double duty for them.

Captain Murphy is the son of Mrs. Arlene Murphy of the Wethersfield faculty, and is attached to a mobile laboratory of the 85th Evacuation Hospital. He has a Ph. D. from Yale as a bio-chemist.

After arriving in Viet Nam, Capt. Murphy became acquainted with a Mr. Ai, principal of Troung Trung Hoc Ky Thuat (Technical High School) of Qui Nhon. He says that Mr. Ai impresses him as a man of the highest ability and integrity. The captain learned that Mr. Ai has a master's degree in industrial education from Los Angeles State College.

Capt. Murphy began teaching English to the teachers of the school, and in so doing became aware of the many problems facing Mr. Ai, his faculty, and most of all, the young students. He put all of these discoveries down in letters to his mother, who in turn told WHS Principal Joseph Winek and the high school students about them.

The students prevailed on Winek and Mrs. Murphy to let them carry out some project to assist the Vietnamese school. Upon learning of the offer, Captain Murphy was most pleased and wrote the students of several ideas he thought could possibly be carried out.

The students chose to earn money on their own—not soliciting their parents for it—and then asked that it be dispatched to the captain to use as he saw fit for the students at Qui Nhon.

They earmarked book fines to the fund for one month because Mrs. Murphy is librarian at Wethersfield. At the annual Junior-Senior prom a smiling, costumed and bowing Arab demanded a stipend from the couples as they entered the Arabian Nights setting in the gym and earned $12 for the Viet Nam school. Some of the young people shined shoes during the school noon hours, others gave up candy and coke money.

Captain Murphy wrote that war the caused an inflation of prices which has doubled the cost of living in the Qui Nhon area during the past few months. This places a great burden on the students, he said, many of whom have been forced to quit school. The teachers, whose monthly salary is equivalent to about $60, presently support 30 of these students, who otherwise would have had to leave.

"We of the military are helping by hiring some of the boys to help in our laboratory, and by contributing to the 'rice fund'," the captain writes. "However, it would seem especially appropriate for Americans of the same age and situation to aid this cause.

"There are many aid projects in this country which give little lasting benefit, and often sizable proportion of aid money never reaches the intended recipient. To provide aid directly to a technical school, which gives training essential to the economic development of this country, would seem particularly worthy," writes Captain Murphy.

And, now, months later, the money has been earned and the Wethersfield students are proud to learn through word from Captain Murphy and one of the Vietnamese students what the money will be used for. The Army has contributed cement, no doubt at Capt. Murphy's suggestion, and the $100 from Wethersfield will be used for lumber to build a dormitory so the homeless Vietnamese boys, seeking an education though thwarted by war, will have a place to live while pursuing their studies.

Let's Travel: With Mrs. L.B.J. to Big Bend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this spring, America's First Lady, as a part of her campaign to keep America beautiful, visited Big Bend National Park, in my west Texas district. Among the correspondents who accompanied the tour, of which I was honored to be a part, was Frances Koltun, travel editor of Mademoiselle magazine. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to bring Miss Koltun's excellent article to the attention of Congress:

LET'S TRAVEL: WITH MRS. L.B.J. TO BIG BEND

(By Frances Koltun)

Normally, about 50 people a year drift down the Rio Grande through the sheer-walled Mariscal Canyon—and these are largely college students from here and abroad. It is remote country, difficult to reach. Last April, its awesome stillness was shattered by a strange flotilla of 24 heavily laden rubber rafts; the cactus wrens and Mexican jays must have looked down in amazement. Not since the wandering bands of Comanches and Apaches, had such a gathering come to this wild, silent country.

The occasion was the visit of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson to Big Bend National Park. Accompanying her were Secretary of the Interior and Mrs. Stewart Udall, George B. Hartzog, Jr., Director of the National Park Service, and a curious expeditionary force of writers, photographers, TV commentators and crews, wire-service and newspaper reporters, plus a sprinkling of magazine representatives, MLLE's Travel Editor among them. The avowed purpose of Mrs. Johnson's trip was to focus attention on Big Bend in particular and the National Parks in general, for 1966 marks the 50th anniversary of the founding of the National Park Service. Presidential and Federal interest in recreation and conservation have never been greater than they are at this moment.

Her trip was also meant to emphasize the campaign to Keep America Beautiful. Reserving the beauty of our landscape and salvaging our national heritage are the major concerns of the National Park Service—and while she heads no Federal agency or bureau, Mrs. Johnson has become the Administration's leading spokesman for this effort.

Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "There is nothing so American as our national parks." He meant, of course, that within their confines, the scenery and wildlife are quintessentially native. But there are another less-understood aspect of his statement: few people realize that only the *choicest* of our areas are ever raised to the status of a national park. No terrain is ever taken into the National Park Service unless it is considered matchless among regions of its kind. Thus, the national parks are an aggregation of superb areas of enormous variety and richness. These are the great scenic places—the deserts and mountains, rain forests and rock coasts, the sand dunes, even the swamps—and the National Park Service is their custodian for the American people. Caught before they were despoiled, they remain vast stretches of fresh land; within their boundaries you can know what America was like before it was scarred by cities, highways and railroads, farms and industry, and suburban sprawl.

The parks, however, are for pleasure, not just preservation. They must, of course, be maintained absolutely unimpaired for future generations, but they are also meant to be used and enjoyed. Here, you can camp, ride, fish, hike, and glory in the great outdoors. Here, you are meant to know the serenity of mountains and forest, the gleam of a glacier, the roar of the surf, the life of strange new plants and animals; or, simply, if this is what you seek, space, solitude, and silence.

In choosing Big Bend for her visit, Mrs. Johnson, characteristically, picked a park that deserves far more notice than it gets. (Of the more than 9,000,000 visitors to our parks last year, fewer than 200,000 came here.) Isolated and hard to reach, Big Bend National Park is a harsh, hauntingly beautiful landscape of spectacular desert, canyons, sienna-colored plains, mesas, and weird, timeless mountains. It is lonely country (the nearest good-sized grocery store is 100 miles from the park's center), and if you are unaccustomed to such terrain, its vast space may seem, at first, more like emptiness. But it is a hypnotic landscape and, given a few days, you will be in its thrall forever.

The park takes its name from the deep curve or big bend that the Rio Grande makes—about 300 miles downstream from El Paso. Embraced by the curve are 700,000 acres, a vast primitive wilderness that preserves the best of the Chihuahuan desert. Along its southern border flowing quietly for 107 miles is the Rio Grande, the peaceful boundary between the U.S.A. and Mexico. It is this land that makes up Big Bend, our sixth-largest national park, now swept into the stream of White House history.

It has known its share of history before, for where the Rio Grande makes its wedge into Mexico, the Spaniards moved north from the border and the Indians moved south from the Great Plains country; war between the Indians and the ranchers was still going on as late as the 1860s. As you ride or hike along canyon walls, you are reminded of the time when America was young and westward-bound through Texas.

Erosion has been Big Bend's master-draftsman, creating fantastic gorges, strange rock formations, and its ghostly Chisos mountains. Millions of years ago, it was the floor of a vast inland sea and, as you drive along, the illusion of that sea still surrounds you, only now it is a sea of strangely carved land.

Time after time, the crust of this earth has been fractured by gigantic upheavals. The surface changes quickly from gorge, to sunbaked plain, to a sudden thrust of mountain range.

Here, dinosaurs roamed, and scientists have found the fossilized remains of oysters three to four feet wide. Many colleges bring their students hundreds of miles to study the unique geology of this area. Because millions of fossil fish remain embedded in its limestone, paleontologists come from all over the world.

During one of our flights, Secretary Udall described a national park as being "in essence, a vast zoological garden without a fence around it," and he called the Big Bend country a "new kingdom of plants and animals." Within it are rare species of trees, birds, and plants that are found nowhere else, making it a biological island and a magnet for zoologists, botanists, and biologists.

This is not a park meant for soft pleasures, and because of its ruggedness, our exhilarating visit took on the sense of an adventure, as yours will, too. The first afternoon, Mrs. Johnson and company hiked, as all visitors do, up the Lost Mine Trail, a path that climbs through piñon and juniper until it ends at an overlook from which one can see into the purple distance of Mexico. The next day, we paddled in rubber rafts down the Rio Grande, where it cuts through Moriscal Canyon, the least accessible of the park's three canyons through which the river flows. It was a day of warm sunshine and brilliant blue skies. The odd flotilla made its slow day downstream—swirling, getting caught in the rapids, bumping into each other like the cars at an amusement park—for nearly six hours. The canyon walls, carved by wind and water—one side the U.S.A., the other, Mexico—towered beside us. At noon we drew up to a sand bar for a picnic lunch. Mrs. Johnson, looking marvelously turned out in slim pants and checked shirt, sat among us on the grassy bank, at ease and obviously delighted.

At the end of the day, her nose reddened by the sun, Mrs. Johnson was asked how she felt about it all. She said, "How wonderful it is to be able to get so completely out in the wilderness away from towns and cities, and to find that this much solitude still remains in the U.S.A." Then, turning back to the reporters, she said she wanted to add something: "How very pleasant simple things can be: a vagrant breeze, a drink of water, just the feeling that you have enough strength to cope with paddling a canoe—to get out in the open and to come to terms with things."

And all of us—wet-bottomed, slightly bruised, and thoroughly happy with our extraordinary day on the Rio Grande—looked around at the soaring canyon, the mountains glowing gold in the clear, desert light—the vista without beginning or end—and agreed.

Congress and University: A Partnership in Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

CONGRESS AND THE UNIVERSITY: A PARTNERSHIP IN HEALTH

(Address by Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, University of the Pacific, June 15, 1966)

President Burns, Dean Tocchini, University Regents, Members of the Graduating Class, Ladies and Gentlemen: The first thing I want to do, of course, is to extend my congratulations and best wishes to those of you who have just now received your doctorates in dentistry. As one who has long had a deep, personal interest in your new profession, I have some idea of the rigors of your past four years in dental school, not to speak of the lengthy period of preprofessional education. The degree you have received symbolizes an accomplishment in which you and your families can take great pride. It marks, as well, the beginning of a promising future for each of you. No one, naturally, can promise that the future will be entirely innocent of complications and frustrations. Indeed, any one of you could take over this lectern and give the rest of us chapter and verse on what some of the problems might well be. On graduation day, nonetheless, it seems to me permissible for you to take a laissez faire attitude toward the future and, if only for twenty four hours, concentrate on the pleasures of the present. This may well be the last day of your life when you, your family and friends can all agree on how wholly admirable you are and you should make the most of it.

I want, as well, to express my deepest gratitude to the officers of the University of the Pacific and its dental school for the high honor you have done me this evening. It has been said that "science promises us neither peace nor happiness; it promises only truth." Such a promise, it seems to me, is value enough and if this doctorate in science you have so generously bestowed holds the key to the truth in any way at all, it is worth a dozen trips across the continent, not the mere one I have in fact taken.

According to the program you have received, the topic toward which my brief remarks will be directed is "Congress and the University: A Partnership in Health." I do not, of course, mean to imply by that title that health is the only matter of common concern Congress and the University have, though certainly it would be a simpler and more pleasant world if that were so; if, indeed, we could reasonbly say that the question of health could be dealt with in the abstract and without reference to any of the other challenges facing our society today. Were that true, there would be no end to the noble predictions that could be made. There would be no need to have the slightest hesitancy about the future.

Regrettably, such a view would be a pretense; would be futile; would be, in the long run, impossible. The question of health, like every other fundamental consideration with which we must deal, is woven deeply and inextricably into the fabric of our society. Decisions taken in health affairs inevitably interact with decisions taken in other areas of concern. If a priority is given to health, then it cannot be given to something else. Money spent on health cannot at the same time be spent on something else. A man who devotes his life to health affairs cannot at the same time devote that life to business or politics or the fine arts. We are faced, as always, not with the easy decision of choosing the good in preference to the bad.

We are faced with the hard decision of choosing them among a variety of good things and arranging them in an order that reflects a fundamental social decision concerning our relative need for them at a precise time in our history. We must talk about health matters at the same time as we talk about our commitment to the underdeveloped nations or the war on poverty or the war in Vietnam.

This question of the standing of health on the scale of the cultural, economic and political facts of modern life has been of concern to me for some years. It has been, indeed, inescapable since the life of a Member of Congress centers about the necessity of standing up and being counted a dozen times a month on this business of sorting out America's priorities and deciding which ones we need to emphasize, which ones we need to meet first. And, to complicate matters a bit further, the process is carried out in a public forum with all the pressures inherent in such a method. It is something like a dentist standing in the town square surrounded by a crowd of people clamoring for his services and needing to decide which one or two or three patients he will care for that day and which ones will have to wait until tomorrow or next week or next year when it may be too late to really help them.

Out of this kind of experience, which in my case began in 1940, has evolved a set of convictions. One is that our nation has, in the past, underestimated and, to some extent, misunderstood the impact health has on our total progress as a nation. We have as a consequence, been needlessly diffident about devoting to health matters a sufficient share of our resources such as to enable us to realize our full potential in this area. There are some, I know, who would disagree with this analysis but the facts, I think, are not with them.

At the present time, only about six percent of our Gross National Product is being spent in the health field. And most of that represents payment from a member of the public to a private practitioner for personal health service. Less than one percent of the Gross National Product is being devoted to health related research, education and public health activities. Surely, this is not over-emphasis.

Believing as I do, then, it has been pleasing to see this diffidence beginning to dissipate; to see us, at length, coming to a fuller understanding of how significant to our daily life and to our basic strength as a nation is the work being carried out in our laboratories, clinics and private practices. It seems to me that we are today on the threshold of a totally new public attitude, one that holds out to us more promise than any other in our history. This change has had and will continue to have its effect on many institutions but it seems to me that its impact is especially clear on Congress, on the University and on the partnership they have formed. Before commenting on why I think this is so and what it means to these two institutions, however, let me offer briefly some evidence to document what I call this change in our concern for health matters.

A convenient starting point in offering evidence is the National Institutes of Health. This bureau of the Public Health Service is, as you know, the major health research arm of the federal government. Nearly all federal funds devoted to health research are distributed through it. From its beginnings in 1798, the Institutes had progressed by 1946 to a point where its annual budget totalled $3 million. In the twenty years since that time, growth has been much swifter. In early May of this year, the House of Representatives passed a fiscal 1967 budget bill that allots $1.4 billion to the National Institutes of Health.

Incidentally, in the same post-war span of years, the National Institute of Dental Research has progressed from an annual budget of $510,000 to an allocation in the recently passed House bill of $28 million.

Only a small percentage of this money is used intramurally by the National Institutes of Health. Almost all of the $1.4 billion is instead distributed by means of grants and contracts to the universities of the nation to support their ongoing investigations. Some of the money, as well, is used to provide fellowships for those preparing themselves for a research career and, finally, a segment of it is devoted to support universities in the renovation or construction of health research facilities.

At the same time as this growth has been readily discernible in health research, new national emphasis has also been brought to bear to meet the shortage of health manpower, a shortage that already exists in some specialties and is clearly impending everywhere else. The key piece of legislation in this effort is the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act that the Late President Kennedy first signed into law in 1963 and that has been, subsequently, revised and expanded. The law has a three-fold purpose: first of all, it provides assistance for construction of health educational facilities; secondly, it provides loans and scholarships to students of the health professions, and, finally, it provides direct grants to health schools for curriculum improvement. A number of people—the leaders of the American Dental Association and myself included—long urged such legislation. One of the most active and effective dental educators doing so was Dean Tocchini. It is appropriate, then, that when the law was passed one of the first grants made under its provisions was for a new dental school here at the University of the Pacific.

The third segment of the health field in which new stirrings can be detected is that of provision of care. Here there is no central agency, such as the National Institutes of Health, nor no single, key piece of legislation, such as the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. The pace of activity nonetheless has perceptibly increased. This present Congress, for example, has passed legislation that broadens significantly the kind of health services made cooperatively available to the indigent and the medically indigent by state and federal governments. This legislation is shaped, properly I believe, to place special emphasis on needy children.

This same emphasis on the young can be seen in the health aspects of the War on Poverty, particularly with regard to Project Headstart, which is designed to assist three and four year old children from impoverished families and to prepare such children for their school years in a more adequate way than has been possible ever before. Since Project Headstart has begun, incidentally, those directing it have discovered how accurate the dental profession has been over the years in pointing out that oral disease is the single most serious health problem these youngsters suffer from.

Closely related to individual well being is the area of public health. Again, we are seeing an increase in the pace of activities. In environmental health, for example, programs combatting air pollution and water pollution are being mounted. In dentistry, at the National Dental Health Center located here in San Francisco, there has begun a notable series of research investigations on cleft lip and palate and on periodontal disease.

Taken as a whole, then, this outline of the new level of effort being mounted by this nation in the health field is most significant. Some of us might wish that this effort would have been mounted sooner, would have been mounted, say five or ten years ago. But the future is clearly too complex and challenging for us to worry about what might have been. Instead, the question that we now must face is how best to master this widening spectrum of health activities, how to keep control of it so that such resources as are devoted to it will be used as meaningfully and fruitfully as possible.

It is here that we arrive at the concept of partnership between Congress and the University. The concept is, I would submit, a key one in any plan we may devise to define and guide our progress toward a more effective, more efficient and more readily accessible health research, health education and health care system of tomorrow.

The indications that this is so are overwhelming. Consider the field of health research. It is founded precisely on this partnership concept. There is a well defined division of effort in health research. The Universities of the nation, for their part, have undertaken to supply the ideas and the workers in this field. Congress and the rest of the federal government, as its part of the partnership agreement, provides coordination to preclude undesirable duplication, reviews applications to assure that previously agreed upon standards are maintained and provides most of the funding. There are exceptions to this but by and large it is a fair description of how we proceed in health research.

The burden of this arrangement, it seems to me, lies most heavily on the universities, not the government. Certainly, most university officers of my acquaintance are quick to say so. But one doesn't have to be a university official to recognize that ideas are rarer, harder to come by, more precious than our dollars. You can't buy that combination of imagination, insight and industry that leads to the kind of research breakthroughs we have experienced in the United States since World War II. To achieve them, you must develop a man who shows promise, give him the room and tools he needs and have faith in his ability to produce. Ultimately, it is the university that must welcome and shelter such men.

Much the same is true, in terms of the balance of partnership obligation, in the field of health education. Congress is in a position to recognize that support of health education is imperative, to recognize that more health professionals must be graduated annually than we are able to do today. Congress can authorize new programs to meet the situation and then move to fund such programs adequately. But Congress cannot graduate a single physician, dentist or nurse. In fairness to Congress, I should point out that I don't mean to deny it can be highly educational in many ways, its just that the practice of dentistry or medicine is not included in its broad curriculum.

This partnership concept, as I have just delineated it here, is not totally a creation of the post-war era. But, I would submit, the events of the past twenty years have so transformed it that, in the practical sense, it is new. There is today an interchange between the man in the University and the man in Congress that has never really existed before in this country. There is, I think, a greater feeling of trust flowing from both parties. The cliche professor who didn't understand the urgent realities of life has pretty well disappeared. So too, I hope, has the Congressman who lacked respect for academic endeavor and its longterm contribution to the quality of our society. There has been, from time to time, a sense of strain and of misunderstanding. This will still occur in the future. But today such misunderstanding is an isolated incident, not an intrinsic characteristic of the partnership.

I have no hesitation in saying that the partnership has been of benefit to Congress and, certainly, to this particular Member of Congress. Aside from my general responsibilities, I have, as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee responsible for health expenditures, the obligation of deciding annually how billions of dollars of public funds are going to be invested. Such an annual expenditure, obviously, does much to shape the direction and thrust of our effort in the health field. I need to have, in discharging that obligation, the candid, expert advice of those who are professionally involved in health. I couldn't do the job without it.

By the same token, if I may say so, I think the University has benefitted from this more active and intimate partnership that has developed since World War II. I think it has spurred more than one such institution to rethink its posture in relation to the society surrounding it. I think it has spurred more than one such institution to shoulder willingly a more active and responsive role in combatting the ills that plague that society.

It is to be hoped, in any case, that my estimate of the partnership as having achieved a sound and lasting character is accurate since the demands of the future are going to exert heavier pressure than ever on the bond that links Congress and the University.

We need, I believe, to continue to step up substantially our commitment to health research. We need, I believe, to continue to pay greater attention to the health manpower problem. We need, I believe, to continue to search for new and better methods for distributing our health care so that it is as readily accessible as possible to all our citizens.

In all of these instances, the University will play a vital part. The academician will be needed both as an advisor and and as an implementor. The University itself will be needed to serve as the laboratory in which new ideas are studied, not just for their pragmatic effectiveness and for the larger implications they may hold.

All of this, as I have already said, will have to be pursued while at the same time we continue to pay attention to the national and international context within which health problems must be viewed. Neither institution will be able to retire from the arena where health needs clash with the many other pressing needs of this country's people. Neither institution will be able to shirk the responsibility of helping to set priorities for meeting these problems.

I have great confidence, however, that both institutions, in partnership, will be able to continue this work and will be able to make greater contributions in the future than we have thus far. It is for this reason that I am so pleased to be here with you this evening to share my thinking on this subject. It is because I look to the University so often for advice and support that your generous action in honoring me holds such meaning. Let me close, then, by again offering my best wishes to those who have begun tonight their professional careers in dentistry. I look forward to being with you again some time in the future. Thank you.

The Beirut Agreement and U.S. Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on June 28, House Joint Resolution 688 was ordered reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. This resolution, and an identical one which I introduced, House Joint Resolution 1158, would authorize the President to designate a Federal agency to be responsible for carrying out the provisions of the agreement for facilitating the international circulation of visual and auditory materials of an educational, scientific, and cultural character. This agreement, better know as the Beirut agreement, would provide a certification procedure whereby each qualifying imported audiovisual item is guaranteed to be of an educational, scientific, or cultural character, and is therefore free of duty no matter in how many implementing countries it is shown or otherwise used.

When I introduced House Joint Resolution 1158 on June 6, I pointed out that implementation of this agreement would increase duty-free exports of U.S. audiovisual products to foreign countries—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 6, 1966, page 11705. An article by Alena Wels in the Journal of Commerce—June 16, 1966, page 1—entitled "Foreign Boom Looms in U.S. Industrial Films," illustrates some of the benefits that implementation of this agreement could provide. It is most significant that makers of industrial films, a $400 million activity in the United States last year, feel that "the export of nontheatrical films would at least double within 5 years" after the United States implements this agreement. The free interchange of all types of educational material can provide the benefits of understanding and greater knowledge for all the countries involved. When an agreement will add to international understanding, as well as substantially increase U.S. exports. I think it should be expedited as much as possible. For that reason, I ask the Members of this body to support House Joint Resolution 688 when it comes before the House, and submit this article for their consideration:

[From the Journal of Commerce, June 16, 1966]

WITH BEIRUT ACCORD: FOREIGN BOOM LOOMS IN U.S. INDUSTRIAL FILMS

(By Alena Wels)

Americans, who have been much maligned in their business and poltical involvements abroad in recent years, will be able to strike back with a new more graphic approach when the United States finally puts its long withheld signature to the Beirut Convention.

Industrial films, a $400 million activity in this country, could soon become an important method for establishing the American industrial image abroad and for promoting American products and ideas in important foreign markets.

CUTS RED TAPE

Designed to facilitate the free flow of films of a scientific educational and cultural nature, the Beirut Convention will help do away with much of the red tape which has restricted the export of American films of this kind to date.

When it is ratified, industry sources feel, the export of non-theatrical films would at least double within five years. It is understood that most governments will be liberal in their interpretation of what is considered "educational" and the way will be opened for foreign screening of the innumerable films made by the 550 American producers specializing in industrial and business films and 3,000 industrial firms with production facilities.

Currently only a small proportion of their films is distributed abroad but U.S. distributors of non-theatrical subjects already have begun to lay plans for the development of expanded sales. As is natural because of the language affinity and the advanced state of that country's own film industry, Britain is the first port of call.

Thus, Association Films, for example, which distributes films for such diverse organizations as U.S. Steel, Johnson and Johnson, American Airlines, UNICEF and several foreign clients, including Alitalia, the Italian Line, the German Federal Railroads and the German Tourist Information Office, recently reached a distribution agreement with Britain's Rank organization.

The agreement opens up 15 countries to American clients and negotiations are underway for a good many more, including Czechoslovakia.

Robert M. Finehout, vice president of Association Films, explained in an interview that undeveloped channels of distribution, prohibitive tariffs and disturbing red-tape are the major blocs to the expansion of foreign screenings of American films. The Rank agreement overcomes some of these difficulties, enabling Association clients to take advantage of the Rank distribution network and promotional activities.

Rank also undertakes to dub American films into a number of foreign languages. The inclusion of lip synchronized dialogue in a film rather than off-screen commentary makes it a more expensive proposition, however, such drubbing costing up to $2,000.

Mr. Finehout also indicated that Association has a Canadian subsidiary and films are distributed in Mexico under the sponsorship of the Mexican Ministry of Education. The Ministry, he added, provides mobile trucks which carry projection equipment to audiences around the country.

GOOD FUTURE SEEN

There's a good future for the growth of American films for international promotion purposes through educational organizations and directly to clients, Mr. Finehout said. But a good deal has to be done by the countries themselves to make distribution feasible.

He explained how the films made for his 225 clients are distributed in the U.S. The greatest growth is through school class rooms where up to 70 per cent of the films are shown. We understimate the spending power and the eventual influence of the teenager, Mr. Finehout observed. "Teenagers represent an $11 billion market now and it is moreover, important for our sponsors to reach them at a time when they are receptive to new ideas."

The remaining 30 per cent of the industrial film audience is caught through various professional societies, political action groups, national service organization and civic and special interest groups.

Airport theaters are becoming increasingly important as outlets for travel sponsored films. Also of great significance are commercial and educational television stations, which are offered the various sponsored films free of charge and make considerable use of them.

FEW ACCEPT FILMS

Mr. Finehout pointed out that the latter outlet is generally unknown overseas where many television stations are government owned and do not accept sponsored films. This, however, is changing slowly. Motion picture theaters, on the other hand, are more widely used for advertising in Europe and are, therefore, more receptive to sponsored films.

While most of the films produced are 16 mm, there has been an increasing trend to the use of 8 mm sound films for industrial training and as a direct sales device, Mr. Finehout said. They require less equipment to produce and projection equipment is compact and portable. These films are produced primarily by "in-house" production units.

The American method of distribution of non-theatrical films, Mr. Finehout concluded, is one of the few ways a company's image or idea can reach both a mass audience and a highly selective audience with specialized interests.

Thomas W. Hope, who compiles the annual review of the audio-visual field for the Journal of the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers, points out that the whole industry is "running wild" this year.

SWING TO COLOR

He attributes the great expansion in production to non-theatrical films to the swing to color and the growing government interest in supporting educational films.

The government, he pointed out, is also concerned about the relatively low exports of these films abroad—estimated at some $4 million last year—and is strongly behind the passage of the Beirut Convention, which was first drafted in 1948. At recent hearings on the Convention, he added, there was apparently unanimous support in government and business testimony for the provisions of the agreement.

Retirement of Lt. Gen. Charles B. Duff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on the last day of this month—July 1966—one of this Nation's distinguished military leaders will retire from active duty after 35 years of commissioned service. I refer to Lt. Gen. Charles B. Duff, a 1931 graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, who has commanded the U.S. Army Air Defense Command, with headquarters at Ent Air Force Base in Colorado Springs, Colo., since September 3, 1963. In an appropriate ceremony on August 1, at Fort Carson, Colo., he will hand over the responsibilities of that vital command to a West Point classmate, Lt. Gen. Robert Hackett.

Many of the gentlemen of this House, especially those who have served on the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services, will recall with pleasure, I am sure, those times when General Duff appeared before the committees to give expert testimony on Army financial matters.

Although I was not privileged to be a Member of this House and its committees at the time, my colleagues have kindly pointed out to me that they remember General Duff as a very cooperative witness, an expert in the usually tricky field of finance who had reduced typical financial terminology into language that could be understood by all members of the committees. Certainly his expert and understandable testimony assisted the Members of this House in performing the legislative functions incident to the Army's vital role in our national defense.

Among his many assignments in the Army, General Duff served for over 8 years in the Department of the Army budget and financial offices. Before becoming Comptroller of the Army in 1962 he served as Assistant Chief of the Estimates and Funding Division for the Army and later as director of the Army budget.

General Duff and his wife, the former Miss Sallie Edmondson of Anniston, Ala., plan to make their home in the Colorado Springs area following retirement. I am pleased that the Duffs will become permanent residents of Colorado's Third Congressional District.

National Airlines Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more certain to today's fast moving American public than the fact that a major transportation strike is both inconvenient and intolerable.

Our dependence on the airlines presently being struck has reached such proportions that even their temporary shutdown causes serious repercussions. Not only are the airlines themselves the only parties injured by this strike. We are now tightly bound together, in all parts of the country, by the air. We depend on it for freight, for business travel, and for the tourist trade. A strike against airlines, Mr. Speaker, is a strike against the public, for all the population is inconvenienced in some way.

Other employees of the airlines must be given leave, the hotel industry depending on convention and tourist traffic suffers, movers of air freight must turn to slower means of transportation or line up for the remaining facilities. Bus and train terminals became congested, and more and more people are forced onto our crowded urban highways.

Settlement of this strike at the earliest possible moment should be urged in a single coordinated demand by the public, the Congress, and the President, acting together in what has become an emergency situation to restore these vital air services.

The time has come also for the Congress to carefully review present emergency strike legislation under the Taft-Hartley Act to consider whether revisions are necessary to assure that our urban and industrial society will never again be deprived of its essential transit links.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, the week of July 17–24 marks the eighth consecutive commemoration of what is known as Captive Nations Week. During this week, Americans will gather to manifest their concern for the plight of the freedom-loving people of the world who today find themselves the captives of aggressive totalitarian imperialists. Certainly Captive Nations Week stands as a reminder to all of us who enjoy the benefit of freedom and liberty that the long-range goal of self-determination and freedom is yet to be achieved by countless millions behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains of the world.

Certainly those of us who have any historical appreciation of the world situation in Europe and in Asia understand that no amount of occupation by Communist puppet governmental leaders can still the burning desires of the freedom-loving peoples of these enslaved lands. These peoples, no matter how long the term of their occupation by outside forces, still look to the United States of America as their hope for once again reclaiming their freedom and independence. Every intelligence report, every diplomatic contact confirms without doubt that there is strong aspiration for free, democratic, consitutional government in the occupied countries of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and the area of the Ukraine.

Captive Nations Week gives us cause to pause and reflect upon the horrors of Communist enslavement that have been visited upon these peoples and to rededicate ourselves to the task of sympathetically pursuing ways and means of bringing these enslaved people their natural right of self-determination. Captive Nations Week is the week in which the United States of America should record for the world once again its long-range intention to work for the interests of the enslaved peoples of the world who suffer under the oppressive yoke of Communist occupation.

The liberation of these people, our fellow human beings of different national identities, creeds, and colors, should be the mission of this Republic for this Republic was born in a spirit of resistance and rebellion to tyrannical imperialism and it should pledge in the world forums to help all peoples in their difficult struggle for freedom and national independence.

Criminal Brutality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I can remember the day when the police, in the eyes of the public at large, from children playing cops and robbers to adults, were viewed as the "good guys" of American society and the criminals were the "bad guys." I say "remember" intentionally; it seems more and more evident that this picture of the police as guardians of society and as symbols of law and order is being systematically destroyed. In many instances they are being deliberately and unfairly depicted as greater enemies of the American people than the criminals whom they are sworn to oppose and who purposely live outside the bounds of society.

This is truly appalling and the damage it has done and can do to every individual and agency charged with the writing or enforcing of law cannot be measured. From the ill-considered policy of selective obedience to law, that is, obey only those laws which you as an individual choose to obey, we have progressed to the point where direct and vicious attacks are leveled at the instruments of law enforcement themselves.

I believe the following editorial from the July 11, 1966, Indianapolis Star makes an excellent point. "Police brutality" is a cry raised out of all proportion to its actual occurrence. "Criminal brutality" is the real threat to our society.

The editorial follows:

CRIMINAL BRUTALITY

Broadway columnist Walter Winchell issues the "police brutality" note that 478 New York policemen were shot, stabbed or otherwise injured making arrests last year.

Meanwhile, J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation said, "We know there is a calculated and deliberate attempt by some groups to inflame hostility against law enforcement by charging 'police brutality' without cause. To a large degree they have succeeded. The term is bandied about in all media of communication without serious consideration as to its true meaning or its harmful effect on a profession which is charged with enforcing the basic rules of civilized living."

The fact is that almost all charges of "police brutality" throughout the nation have proven to be groundless. What is not groundless is the overwhelming number of cases of criminal brutality against law-abiding citizens and law-enforcement groups responsible for defending the citizenry.

We wonder what the effect would be if every newspaper in the country published a daily box score under the headline "criminal brutality" where a list would be made of the innocent people beaten, robbed, mugged, assaulted, raped or battered in the previous 24 hours. Such a box score would probably elicit a terrible wail from that noisy minority that claims "there are no criminals, just sick, or alienated or disadvantaged people." These defenders of the criminal element would charge newspapers with trying to whip the law-abiding group into a frenzy against the thugs. But it may well be that such a frenzy against thugs and bums is just what we need to reverse the rising tide of crime.

Bill To Create a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this Chamber who does not realize the gravity of the crime problem. Directly or indirectly it affects all of us. Statistics released recently by the FBI show that in the first 3 months of 1966 there was a 6-percent increase in the number of crimes over the same period of last year. In the next 24 hours over 7,000 major crimes will be committed in the United States. The FBI estimates the total cost of such crimes to be over $27 billion annually—or $143 for every man, woman, and child throughout the Nation. Even more unfortunate is the fact that this rate appears to be ever increasing. Projections based upon present statistics indicate that by 1985 1 American in every 15 will be the victim of a major crime.

I am certainly not one to be smitten with "imaginary horribles"; however, the fact does remain that at this moment we are experiencing an unprecedented wave of lawlessness which should be dealt with now and not sometime in the future when the problem may be of uncontrollable magnitude. The present crime rate reflects a real need for updating many of our criminal laws. Problems of lawlessness, particularly organized crime, are crying for solution.

Despite the increase in nearly all types of crime, our Federal criminal laws have not undergone a major revision in 18 years. We, as legislators, have clearly not kept pace with the new horizons which are being discovered daily by psychologists, sociologists, criminologists, and penologists in the study of crime and its causes. It is sad, indeed, that our law enforcement agencies must struggle to maintain law and order, and our courts must attempt to dispense evenhanded justice with a Federal criminal code which needs modernization of language and remedies, and elimination of overlapping provisions. In addition, recent Supreme Court decisions relative to criminal safeguards demand a complete review by the Congress with a view toward revising certain fundamental concepts of the federal system of criminal justice.

Recently, I introduced several bills to strengthen the arm of law enforcement agencies in the investigation and prosecution of violations of our Federal criminal code. Also, I have joined with several of my colleagues in urging creation of a National Commission to study the existing laws and to recommend to Congress legislation which would improve our present system of criminal law and procedure.

The Commission would be comprised of 12 members—3 appointed from the House of Representatives, 3 from the Senate, 3 from the Federal judiciary, and 3 from private life. In performing the work of the Commission, the Commissioners will have the assistance of an expert staff, headed by a Director who will act as reporter to the Commission. In addition, the Commission may hire experts in fields requiring special study.

The Commission will have the advice and counsel of an advisory committee, the members of which will be selected from such groups as: defense lawyers, legal aid attorneys, U.S. attorneys—that is, prosecutors—law professors, criminologists, penologists, and others who deal with criminal behavior and the applications of the Federal criminal law. Also the Commission may draw upon the experiences of several States which have revised their criminal codes in recent years.

The great strength in this bill is the fact that the advisory committee would be drawn from a community of men who know the criminal law best—men who live it from day to day. These are the men who develop new ideas and approaches to the law and who may utilize their wealth of talent and experience in producing recommendations for the Commission and ultimately for the Congress. This advisory committee is vital to the work of the committee—vital in the sense that it will be a life force and creative element behind the work of the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to study and support this measure. I deem it to be the next major step in our fight against crime and a first step toward preparing the best laws that can be written to curb the antisocial behavior of the criminal and to provide a full measure of justice for those who would transgress our Federal criminal laws.

Dr. Victor Umbricht, President of the Swiss Center, Speaks at Dedication Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of attending the dedication ceremonies for the Swiss Center on Thursday, June 23, 1966. Among others present were Prof. Friedrich T. Wahlen, former President of Switzerland; deputy mayor of New York City, Robert Price; the Swiss Ambassador to the United States, Felix Schnyder; the Consul General of Switzerland in New York, Dr. Hans Lacher; the General Manager of the Swiss Bank Corporation, H. Strasser; the president of the Fifth Avenue Association and also president of

Lord & Taylor, Mr. Melvin E. Dawley; the president of the Swiss Society of New York, Mr. Frank J. Weibel; and the president of the American Society for Friendship with Switzerland, Mr. T. F. Davies Haines.

At the dedication ceremonies, Dr. Victor Umbricht, president of the Swiss Center spoke of the origins and development of the center. I commend his address to my colleagues:

Remarks of Dr. Victor Umbricht, President of the Swiss Center, at Dedication Ceremonies, June 23, 1966

Distinguished guests, friends.

Energy, imagination, and faith by a number of persons have not brought a long nourished hope to fruition—the dedication today of The Swiss Center.

It was at a dinner party in New York some 4 years back, that a working group was formed to bring reality the long-considered Swiss Center.

It is our pleasure to be here today—four years, many meetings, and a few glasses of wine later—to see this new landmark in the heart of Manhattan dedicated to mark the presence of Switzerland and provide information on all aspects of the country, its peoples and its economy.

Fourteen Swiss enterprises have joined together to establish this 11-story center at 608 Fifth Avenue, near another prestigious tourist attraction, Rockefeller Center.

Our new institution is designed to be a focal point from which to project and foster Swiss economic, cultural, touristic, and other interests in the United States.

In the course of history the Swiss have shown tolerance for one another and charity for others. Switzerland in one way is somewhat like New York, for it is a kind of melting pot. It is made up of 73 per cent German-Swiss, 21 per cent French-Swiss, five per cent Italian-Swiss and one per cent Romansh. This combination of people, speaking different languages, worshiping different religions, have survived as a nation for exactly 675 years . . . which is longer than the Roman Empire lasted between Caesar and Theodosius.

I could go on and on dispelling the myths and discussing today's story of Switzerland, but what could be more symbolic of our country, its diverse interests and its contributions to the world, than the 14 Swiss-affiliated participants who made the Swiss Center a reality. These companies represent all aspects of the Swiss economic life. They are: Swiss Bank Corporations; Swiss Air Transport Company, Limited; Swiss National Tourist Office; Union Bank of Switzerland; CIBA Corporation; Geigy Chemical Corporation; Accident and Casualty Insurance Company-Winterthur; Sandoz, Inc.; The Nestlé Company; Heberlein Patent Corporation; Banque Populaire Suisse; Machine Tool Works Oerlikon; Watchmakers of Switzerland; and Ebauches S.A.

It is clear that there is no Swiss type, and it is clear that the Swiss have a good case for presenting their country to the rest of the world. The Swiss influence has always been present throughout the world. There was the Swiss Louis Chevrolet, for whom an auto was named, Admiral Edward Walter Eberle, Chief of U.S. Naval Operations—of course—and Swiss-descended Walter Schirra who piloted the Gemini spacecraft when the first rendezvous in space was made. There are other contemporaries in the Swiss hall of fame including, architect Le Corbusier, sculptor Giacometti, painter Hans Erni, and writers Dürrenmatt and Frisch.

Today the Swiss Center can assist anyone seeking information, industrial, financial, touristic and other documentation. And if the answer they are looking for cannot be supplied on the premises, The Swiss Center can suggest the best place to find it. The services also include several offices of the participating enterprises.

The Swiss Center has also been conceived as a gathering point for another key audience—the 25,000 or so people who make up the Swiss colony in the United States, a majority of whom live in the Greater New York area. Thousands of them hold double citizenship and are proud to call themselves both American and Swiss.

For the future I hope that facilities can be made available at the Swiss Center to open the doors for lectures, receptions, exhibits, dances and similar gatherings or to giving a chance ot self expression with a Helvetic accent. The sponsors would like to see the proceeds from the Center—as it develops—be turned to setting up a fund to support such activities and, in particular, to assist deserving young artists.

Before closing my remarks about the Swiss Center, I wish to pay a tribute to a man who is not with us today, but who played an important part in bringing it about—that is, Mr. Robert Goelet who owned the property at the time we leased it from him. Mr. Goelet died in February of this year, and so was unable to see the project of the Swiss Center, in which he took a genuine interest, brought to fruition. His executor, counsel and close personal friend, Mr. Sidney Davidson, is however sitting here with me on the dais, and I shall now ask him to convey our warm greetings to the members of Mr. Goelet's family and to tell them that we are thinking of Mr. Goelet on this occasion.

Ladies and Gentlemen, as you know, the invitations for today's luncheon were sent out jointly by the American Society for Friendsip with Switzerland and by the Board of Directors of the Swiss Center. I should like to thank the co-sponsors for today's event, the American Society for Friendship with Switzerland, and I would wish its President, Mr. T. F. Davies Haines, present here, to convey our thanks to his colleagues.

And so today the Star-Spangled banner and the simple standard with its white white cross on a field of red fly together at the Swiss Center symbolizing the friendly ties which Switzerland has always enjoyed with its sister democracy in the New World. It has been a distinct pleasure, and a great source of pride to be the first President of The Swiss Center and to participate in these historic ceremonies. Thank you.

Tom Leach Named Washington Correspondent for Chicago's American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, Chicago's American carried the announcement that Mr. Tom Leach has been named Washington correspondent for this outstanding Chicago newspaper.

Mr. Leach, who started with Chicago's American as a copy boy at the age of 15, has been with the paper ever since. His appointment at the age of 28 to this important post in Washington is a real tribute to his journalistic abilities.

I want to congratulate Mr. Leach on his appointment as Washington correspondent for Chicago's American. He is a capable and experienced reporter, and I know he will serve in the best interests of our great Chicago community and will do an outstanding job in keeping our community informed about events in Washington.

An informed citizenry, as we all know, is our best tool for maintaining a strong democracy.

The article follows:

Tom Leach Our New Washington Reporter

Tom Leach, a staff member of Chicago's American for 13 years, has been named Washington correspondent for this newspaper.

Assigned to the county building for the last 3 years, Leach has developed friendships among political leaders, judges, lawyers, and financial and governmental experts.

Before assuming that post, Leach was a general assignment reporter, covering news of leaders at the municipal and state government levels.

His appointment to Washington at the age of 28 is a tribute to Leach's unusual experience in the 13 years he has been part of the American's staff. He was only 15 when he started with the American as a copy boy.

ATTENDED DE PAUL, N. U.

Leach attended Waller High school and worked as a copy boy at night. After Waller, he attended De Paul university and later Northwestern university.

Ten years ago, Thomas Richard Leach was sent out on his first story as a reporter. Since then he has covered a variety of stories, with the greatest emphasis being placed on governmental affairs.

In announcing Leach's appointment, Luke P. Carroll, managing editor of Chicago's American, said:

"The promotion of Tom Leach to this key post is in line with our policy of promoting from within. This policy produces stability and high morale and is one of the reasons why Chicago's American is now the No. 1 evening paper in this city and the suburbs."

PRAISE FROM BOYLE

Chief Judge John S. Boyle of Circuit court said of Leach:

"Tom is one of the finest young reporters I have ever had the pleasure of meeting. He is alert, ambitious, and completely honest in his reporting.

"Leach's stories concerning the new judicial article and the new civic center and the different divisions of the court have been masterpieces. All of us in the county building are sorry to see him go, happy as we are for his advancement."

WED 2 YEARS AGO

In Washington he will have a chance to renew old friendships with Sen. Douglas, Sen. Dirksen, and the congressmen from this area. In his new work, Leach will concentrate on "behind-the-scenes" stories.

Two years ago, Leach married the former Miss Lynn Hensley. Their first child, Susan Lynn Leach, was born July 2 in Columbus Memorial hospital.

Hopeful Signs in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with no scarcity of crises around the world, the Wichita Eagle remarks that positive and successful events often fail to get the attention they deserve.

One such encouraging development has been the ouster of President Sukarno in Indonesia. The newspaper suggests this action by the Indonesian Peoples Consultative Congress means the Djakarta-Peking partnership has truly ended, the confrontation with Malaysia is over and communism has been outlawed from the land.

In Vietnam, the Wichita newspaper notes, the Mekong Delta is coming back into South Vietnamese hands.

Because these hopeful developments are worthy of attention, I would like to insert in the Record the editorial that appeared in the Wichita Eagle on July 7, 1966. The editorial follows:

A Few Hopeful Signs Brighten Picture in Asia

There is no scarcity of crises in the world, and they dominate our thinking. And we tend to brood about our failures and frustrations as a nation. Consequently, the positive and successful happenings often do not get the attention they deserve.

Something occurred this week which has to be judged a victory by Western standards. The government of Indonesia made official what has been taking place for months—President Sukarno, the erratic and power-hungry president of Indonesia, is out. A more realistic and Western-oriented regime is in.

Sukarno's authority has been steadily diminishing in recent weeks. Now the Peoples Consultative Congress has stripped him of his life presidency and authorized Lt. Gen. Suharto to form a new cabinet. Today Sukarno is truly nothing more than a figurehead.

Indonesia has been heading this direction ever since the abortive Communist coup of last fall. Now we can see how far the nation really has come. The Congress' action means that the Jarkarta-Peking partnership which Sukarno nourished is truly ended, that the explosive confrontation with Malaysia which Sukarno encouraged is over, and (the Indonesian government spelled it out) that communism, Marxism and Leninism are outlawed in the land which not long ago seemed irrevocably leftist.

All this represents an almost incredibly bright spot in the dark world of international events. The prospects for peace in that region of the world are immeasurably improved. So are the hopes for building an Indonesia to the free world's liking. In less than a year the tide has completely reversed.

We are in danger of overlooking bright spots in Viet Nam, too. While attention has been centered on fighting in the North, significant developments have been taking place in the far South. The current issue of U.S. News and World Report tells about them.

Eighteen months ago, the lush Mekong delta was all but lost. Now the South Vietnamese army, with a minimum of U.S. aid, has turned the tables on the Communists.

So far this year more than 2,500 Viet Cong have deserted to government forces. A year and a half ago, only 36 per cent of the delta population was under shaky government control. Now more than 55 per cent is, and another 20 per cent is under "clearance" to make it secure from Red terrorism. Civic action, spearheaded by South Vietnamese "pacification" teams with U.S. advisers, is improving the lot of the villagers. The delta represents a real success story for our side.

We need to realize the significance of these developments. When Indonesia reverses course, when the Mekong delta shows signs of being won, we must be doing something right.

Arizonans Seek Support of Kin and Friends for Desecration of the Grand Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, recently I have received a number of letters from Arizonans containing essentially the same message: that the writer is a former resident of my State or congressional district, that since coming to Arizona he or she has discovered that it is a dry State and in need of water, that "many friends and relatives" from Wisconsin have visited the writer in Arizona or have been visited by him or her since the writer moved to Arizona, and that the writer now plans to write all these friends and relatives in Wisconsin to urge them to urge me to support the construction of two dams in the Grand Canyon. In addition, some of the letters point out that the writer and all the friends and relatives in Wisconsin will watch my vote with interest.

A substantial portion of the population of Arizona consists of recent migrants from other States. Between 1955 and 1960, for example, 6,928 Wisconsin residents moved to Arizona. The proponents of the unnecessary power dams in the Grand Canyon are showing real resourcefulness in employing some of these people in an effort to obtain passage of H.R. 4671.

But not even widespread ties of kinship and friendship will succeed in inducing Americans to accept a major—and unneeded—alteration of one of their great natural resources.

Most Americans and most Members of Congress, I believe, are ready to help Arizona get the water it needs, but to insist that it do so without damming the Grand Canyon.

I include hereafter a letter typical of the correspondence I have received from a number of Arizonans.

I include also a more spontaneous letter in which a 16-year-old Texas youth compares the plan to flood the Grand Canyon—the Bridge and Marble Canyon dams would back up water in the Canyon for 132 of its 280 miles—to the destruction of the Alamo in Texas.

Tempe, Ariz., *July 3, 1966.*

Congressman Henry S. Reuss,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Reuss: Before moving to Arizona, I lived in the district you now represent in Congress. Many of the friends I left in Wis. have spoken well of you. I plan to write to them, as I am to you, urging support of the Colorado River Basin Project legislation now pending.

Contrary to what the so-called preservationists say, the dams at Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon will not "ruin" the Grand Canyon but will actually make much marvelous scenery accessible to millions of Americans.

Arizona and the whole Southwest desperately need this bill passed. The water supply situation is already a critical problem in this state, and threatens to become worse. Assurance of more water in Arizona will benefit the economy of the entire country.

I am strongly urging my friends in Wisconsin to write you requesting that you vote for the Colorado River Project bill. I know that they, as well as I, will watch your vote with interest. Thank you.

Respectfully,
Mr. Russell A. Bennett.

Longview, Tex., *July 12, 1966.*

My Dear Mr. Reuss: I am sixteen years old and will be a junior in high school.

Recently I read in our daily newspaper that the Interior Secretary has proposed a plan to flood the Grand Canyon and that you are fighting the project. What I would like to say is—please keep fighting! The Grand Canyon is a trademark of America. I think that to flood the Grand Canyon in Arizona would be like tearing down the Alamo here in Texas! We have that same problem of badly needed water here in Texas, but it's just in the Western part and our state officials are working out careful plans for the situation.

I haven't seen the Grand Canyon but the day that I do see it I would like to see it unharmed.

Mr. Reuss I'm sure millions of other Americans are fighting with you but in a silent way.

Mr. Reuss please keep fighting.

Sincerely,
Wayne Adams.

Vietnam Poll Results Tabulated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY H. McVICKER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I am including here the results of a poll I conducted in the Second Congressional District of Colorado. I would like to thank the more than 14,000 citizens who took the trouble to inform me of the views they have on the Vietnam war, for my poll was devoted entirely to that subject.

Mr. Speaker, one reason for devoting the entire questionnaire to the subject of Vietnam was that as I conducted a districtwide series of town meetings, I discovered that the war was of such vital interest to my constituents that I should delve deeper into their opinions, giving them a better individual opportunity to express their views on the subject.

One especially gratifying aspect of this questionnaire is that so many persons added comments elaborating their views on one or more of the questions of concern to them. Of those answering, 35.5 percent were Democrats, 30.2 percent Republicans, and 34.3 percent independents. I also intended the questionnaire to point up the complexity of the problem and the difficulty of our decisions. I think the questionnaire served that purpose.

Perhaps the most significant conclusion to be drawn from these answers is that a great majority of those answering felt that our nation has a vital interest in southeast Asia, that our Vietnam intervention was justified, and that we must resist Communist aggression with force if necessary. These conclusions must be tempered however, by the fact that recent political disturbances in Vietnam have created uneasiness and distress among many people.

Mr. Speaker, I take pride in representing one of the most educated, literate and informed constituencies in the Nation. I am certain that the views of the citizens of Colorado's Second Congressional District will be of particular interest to this House.

The results of my poll follow:

McVicker Vietnam survey compilation

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Responding to question
1. Do you think the United States should be involved in Vietnam?	78.4	21.6	99.3
2. Have we expanded the war in Vietnam more than was necessary?	20.0	80.0	99.7
3. Do you think it is vital to the United States to save South Vietnam from a Communist takeover?	80.3	19.7	97.6
4. Does the United States have a vital interest in the future of southeast Asia?	87.5	11.5	97.6
5. Accepting the fact that we are now involved in Vietnam—			
(a) Do you think we should further expand our involvement in the war?	70.9	29.1	92.0
(b) Should we bomb the industrial cities of North Vietnam, knowing that many civilians will be killed?	56.9	43.1	94.3
(c) Should we expand the war by attacking the Vietcong refuge bases and supply routes in Cambodia and Laos?	70.1	29.9	93.6
(d) Should we begin a naval blockage of North Vietnam?	76.7	23.3	96.5
(e) Do you think the United States should officially declare war on North Vietnam?	40.9	59.1	91.6
(f) Would you approve of destroying the agricultural economy of North Vietnam by bombing their dikes and dams and flooding their crops?	50.7	49.3	93.6
6. Would the following decisions be acceptable to you as part of an effort to end the war:			
(a) Consider this a good time to cut losses, cease fighting, and withdraw our troops now	11.1	88.9	99.9
(b) Pull our troops back to defend the coastal cities and air bases and let the South Vietnamese do their own fighting	13.3	86.7	97.8
(c) Confine our military operations to South Vietnam (do not bomb North Vietnam)	13.2	86.8	93.2
(d) Withdraw all American troops immediately after a peace agreement is signed	16.4	83.6	96.4
(e) Withdraw all American troops only after we are sure South Vietnam can defend itself and any peace agreement will be kept by the Communists	78.2	21.8	87.1
(f) Withdraw our troops if requested by the Government of South Vietnam	69.4	30.6	94.0
(g) Keep our troops in South Vietnam. Retain strong military bases in the Far East	63.5	36.6	90.3
(h) Permit one government for both South and North Vietnam to be selected in a free supervised election, even if it seemed probable that the Communists would win	51.6	48.4	92.5
(i) Permit one government for both South and North Vietnam under a "neutral government" guaranteed by the major powers such as Red China, the Soviet Union, France, Great Britain, and the United States	43.7	56.3	88.7
(j) Keep South Vietnam independent from North Vietnam, but permit the Vietcong to run candidates in free elections	42.0	58.0	85.9
(k) Keep South Vietnam independent from North Vietnam with a non-Communist form of government guaranteed by the United States	50.8	49.2	88.1
(l) Expand U.S. participation in the war in an attempt to insure victory	72.9	27.1	94.6
(m) Continue the war at its present level until North Vietnam is defeated, even if it takes years	25.7	74.3	88.4
(n) Use tactical nuclear weapons against the Vietcong	34.4	65.6	92.1
7. Should we bomb strategic targets in Red China—			
(a) Now?	11.1	88.9	88.6
(b) Under no circumstances?	15.1	84.9	71.4
(c) If Chinese "volunteers" enter the war?	49.7	50.3	80.8
(d) Only if China officially enters the war?	26.7	73.7	86.1
8. Do you believe that if Vietnam falls to communism, then all of southeast Asia eventually will become Communist?	69.6	30.4	93.6
9. If we pull out of South Vietnam, do you believe North Vietnam would take over the country?	90.4	9.6	85.2
10. Do you believe that Red Chinese troops are fighting in South Vietnam?	49.4	50.6	83.9
11. Do you think that North Vietnam is—			
(a) Controlled by the Soviet Union?	22.6	77.4	77.5
(b) Controlled by Communist China?	71.6	28.4	87.1
(c) Independent?	31.3	68.7	73.8
12. Some people believe that if South and North Vietnam were united, even under communism, they would pursue an independent policy from that of Red China and the Soviet Union (as Yugoslavia has done):			
(a) Do you believe this is a reasonable possibility?	35.3	64.7	95.7
(b) Would you prefer this to continued war in South Vietnam?	44.8	55.2	96.4
13. Should we continue the war until we achieve an acceptable result, regardless of the cost?	76.1	23.9	97.1
14. Do you believe the United States should press to reassemble the 1954 Geneva Conference as a basis for reaching a Vietnam settlement?	58.3	41.7	90.7
15. Do you think the President has made every reasonable effort to bring the Vietnam war to the negotiating table?	68.5	31.5	96.9
16. Do you think we should turn over the search for a solution to the Vietnam war to the United Nations?	53.3	46.7	90.2
17. Do you think a negotiated peace settlement in Vietnam is possible?	58.6	41.4	92.3
18. Do you think the war will end only when the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese are militarily defeated and unable to continue to fight?	69.5	30.5	91.5
19. Do you think that the war will end only when the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese are convinced that the United States will continue to fight in support of South Vietnam?	61.9	38.1	94.1
20. If the North Vietnamese agree to peace talks, would you prefer—			
(a) A cease-fire during the negotiations? (as in Korea)	60.0	40.0	87.9
(b) Continuing the military pressure during negotiations to prevent a buildup of Communist forces during the peace talks?	65.3	34.7	86.8
(c) To refuse to negotiate until the Communist forces are defeated and driven out of South Vietnam?	25.5	74.5	83.1
21. As an incentive to peace negotiations, should the United States offer to share in joint North-South Vietnam food, health, electricity, and water development programs after the war is over?	63.3	36.7	94.8
22. If a peace agreement is reached in the near future, do you think meaningful free elections will be possible?			
(a) In South Vietnam?	64.8	35.2	89.5
(b) In North Vietnam?	18.7	81.3	84.6
23. Do you feel that our purpose and policy in Vietnam have been adequately explained by our Government?	49.1	50.9	96.3
24. As you understand President Johnson's present policy in Vietnam, are you in general agreement with that policy?	63.8	36.2	89.5

Airline Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the airline strike is causing great hardship to the Nation and a way must be found to bring it to a close. Action is needed now for the strike is having serious effects on hundreds of thousands of people in many vital areas of our economy.

All sections of the Nation are being affected and southern California is among those which is being especially hard hit.

I have received numerous telegrams and letters from residents of the district which I represent and other concerned persons telling of the hardship the strike is causing.

The board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce has issued a statement about the problem which I am submitting for the information of the Congress.

It is vital that action be taken now as called for by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and many others in southern California and throughout the Nation to bring about an immediate settlement.

I urge all-out effort toward this end by the President and the Congress.

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce urges the President of the United States and the Members of Congress to use promptly their best offices to restore full airline service and to insure a fair and equitable settlement of the airline strike.

Prolonged negotiations are still in progress between the International Association of Machinists and Eastern Air Lines, National Airlines, Northwest Airlines, Trans World Airlines and United Air Lines for a labor contract.

The dispute between the International Association of Machinists and the five airlines involved has grounded 60% of the domestic airlift in the United States.

On July 27, the Transport Workers Union will be free to strike American Airlines, which would shut down 80% of the nation's air service, and a month later this Union will be free to strike Pan American World Airways.

Diversion of the international passengers normally carried by Northwest Orient Airlines and Trans World Airlines to foreign flag airlines increases the deficit of the United States international gold payments by $1 million daily.

The daily loss in revenue to the Los Angeles International Airport in landing, parking and other fees exceeds $10,000.00 during the current strike.

Continuance of the strike is crippling business travel, hotel, convention and resort business, the movement of perishable farm products, and is retarding military supply and military travel. Continuance of the strike is affecting the entire economy and commerce of the nation and Southern California particularly.

Its early termination is imperative. Therefore, we urgently request immediate action by the President of the United States and Members of the Congress.

Mr. Stanley Mace Barrett, Editor of Havre de Grace Record, Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on June 21 the distinguished and able editor of the Havre de Grace Record, Mr. Stanley Mace Barrett, died at the Harford Memorial Hospital following a year of failing health. Although Mr. Barrett had been ill for the past year, he remained active in the publishing of the Record and was at his desk until Thursday preceding his death. In tribute to its editor, the Record met its regular Thursday deadline following Mr. Barrett's death, and honored Mr. Barrett with the following memorial editorial, which I quote in part:

At a time of deep and personal sadness, the Record reports the death of its Editor—one who has guided the policies and editorials of this newspaper for more than forty years. The name of Stanley M. Barrett is synonymous with the very best traditions of the Fourth Estate in Havre de Grace and in Harford county.

To such a one as Stanley Barrett there was no call for retreat because of the burden of failing health. His newspaper was so much a part of his life that he gave all of the strength that was in him for as long as that strength lasted and that was until the very end.

Having attained the three score and ten years allotted man and adding nearly four more to that span, Mr. Barrett had, in his time, served his country in war and in peace, both in the Army and in civilian life. His memberships in many civic and service organizations attest to the interest he held in public affairs.

Stanley Barrett was one to welcome the newcomer to the City's life and to give help and encouragement to all. One thing is certain, he was deeply and sincerely concerned with the welfare and best interests of his native home.

There was always something of the nostalgic within him and he took particular pleasure in reminiscing with old friends who stopped by the office for a chat. More often than not the talk would turn to baseball as it was played in the good old days or time spent at the American Can Company as a youth or just plain swimming in the Susquehanna on hot, sultry days.

He (Mr. Barrett) liked nothing better than to be in the middle of a lively political fray. But he was a quiet and gentle man, with the talent for writing about the important issues and encouraging those who sought elective office.

Leave Aid for GI's Should Be Provided

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in testimony before a Special Armed Services Subcommittee, Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, the director of national security and foreign affairs for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, has proposed that the Government pay the air transportation for servicemen on emergency leave, convalescent leave, and leave before going overseas and on returning from overseas.

Noting that in view of the fact that Job Corps trainees were paid Christmas leave expenses last year, General Hittle tellingly asserted that similar assistance can hardly be justifiably denied our fighting men. The State Journal, of Lansing, Mich., has found this latter proposal to be of merit and in an editorial on Thursday, June 16, entitled "Leave Aid for GI's Should Be Provided" recommends its passage into law.

I include this statement in the Record as it is deserving of the attention of my colleagues:

LEAVE AID FOR GI'S SHOULD BE PROVIDED

We agree with the retired Marine general who said in an appearance before a congressional committee this week that if the government could foot the bill for leave expenses for Job Corps trainees it should do the same for members of the nation's armed services.

Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, a former resident of East Lansing who is now an official of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, proposed that the government pay for air transportation for servicemen on emergency leave, convalescent leaves and leaves before going overseas or on returning from overseas.

Hittle made his proposal while testifying at the opening of hearings by a House Armed Services subcommittee into the availability of commercial air transportaiton for military personnel on authorized leave.

He told the committee the V.F.W. was not condemning or approving the decision that paid leave expenses be granted last Christmas to 14,000 Job Corps trainees.

But he said, "Whatever may be the justification for the Job Corps, those in the Job Corps are by no stretch of the imagination serving their country as well or at such cost of life and limb as those who wear the uniform of the U.S. fighting man."

An important point for congressmen to consider in connection with Gen. Hiller's testimony is that members of the military services are at their present posts because their government has ordered them there and these include the thousands who are engaged in active combat in Viet Nam.

When the G.I.'s are on authorized leaves for the purposes listed by Hittle, we share his view that they should not be forced to use their own financial resources for transportation to and from their homes. We think this should be the case even though similar treatment were not accorded those in civilian roles in government programs.

No one is deserving of better treatment at the hands of their country than its military servicemen.

A government which spends billions on space and Great Society programs certainly should not object to the spending that would be necessary to put Gen. Hittle's proposal into effect.

Protection of Veterans Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Record the text of a statement I submitted today to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on my bill H.R. 10557. The committee is currently holding hearings on legislation dealing with veterans' pensions.

My statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE TO THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 19, 1966

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Committee, I want to thank you for this opportunity to present my views on the bill now under consideration before your Committee, H.R. 10557, which seeks to amend title 38 of the United States Code to protect any veteran against a loss of pension as a result of enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965. As sponsor of this measure, I wish to express my deep gratitude to all of you for scheduling these hearing:.

The enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 increased Social Security benefits by 7%. In the case of veterans who were receiving pensions, this increase was treated as an addition to their "income" by the Veterans' Administration for purposes of determining what pension would be paid. This increase in "income" has brought many veterans (an estimated 30,000) over the allowable income limit, at which point their pensions are either decreased or discontinued altogether. Each of the 30,000 veterans lost considerably more than they gained by the increases in Social Security benefits.

Just to give one among many examples in my district, I cite the following: A World War I veteran, who had previously received a pension of $105 a month, ended up with a net loss of $300 a year when his income was raised to over $1,000 by an increase in his Social Security benefits which amounted to $84 a year. Because of the small increase in Social Security benefits his pension was decreased by $25 a month. In a case such as this, common to many veterans, a $300 cut in a yearly income of barely $2,000 could mean a complete and drastic change in one's way of life. A change of this sort at an elderly age is not an easy chore. It can be avoided by the passage of this legislation.

Even though it is true that the 88th Congress authorized a 10% retirement income exclusion for pension purposes and the beneficiaries are receiving more pension in 1966 than they did in 1964, the fact remains that the pension rates for 1966 have been substantially reduced from those of 1965. The fact is that the increase over the 1964 rate resulted from a general increase in pension rates voted by the 88th Congress, and would have been received whether or not the Social Security increase had adversely affected veterans' pensions.

Also, the veterans who were not on the rolls in 1964 became entitled to one rate of pension in 1965 and then, a few months later, it was reduced substantially because of the receipts of a few extra dollars in Social Security payments. Surely, Congress did not intend to deprive these people of all or part of their VA benefits by increasing Social Security payments. These are people who have demonstrated their patriotism beyond the call of their duty as citizens; many have given their lives to their country, and have left widows and children.

On July 7, 1965, the Senate approved, without dissent, an amendment by Senator MILLER of Iowa, which would have prevented any cut-back in veterans' pension payments because of the 7% Social Security increase. Senator LONG, the manager of the Social Security Bill and majority member of the Senate Finance Committee, accepted the amendment after pointing out that there was no intention of having any harsh results by having any veterans deprived of any portion of their pension because of Social Security increases. The amendment went to conference, but unfortunately it was eliminated. This resulted in the situation which now exists, and which my bill, H.R. 10557, seeks to correct.

H.R. 10557 is not identical to the Miller amendment, but it will correct the same unjust condition. If enacted into law, it would eliminate from consideration as income (for purposes of determining eligibility for a pension paid by the Veterans Administration) the increases in monthly Social Security benefits paid to an individual by enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965.

The question regarding the effects of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 on veterans' pensions is: "Have you killed me with kindness?" For those directly involved, the increase in Social Security benefits would appear to be a cruel hoax, and the whole intent of the VA pension program and the new Social Security legislation would seem to be defeated. It was a mistake to have overlooked this flaw in the law passed at that time; this can be proven by the present situation. All of the members of this Committee have undoubtedly heard from their constituents regarding this matter. Many veterans are being hurt and will continue to be hurt if the situation is not corrected promptly. This is not a just way to treat our veterans and widows of veterans who have served our country in every war and remained loyal to our democratic ideals.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge you and the members of your Committee to approve the proposed bill, H.R. 10557, so that those most deserving of aid will receive that to which they are entitled. The impoverished state of many of these people does not warrant any cuts in the low yearly income they receive now, and the intent of Congress was certainly not toward this end in the passage of the Social Security Amendments of 1965.

Jobs for Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, medicare represents one of the most important advances ever made toward solving problems of the elderly.

But there are others, and perhaps none more pressing than the lack of employment opportunities.

Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, recently asserted that America is dedicated to improving the lot of the senior citizens.

Sylvia Porter, the financial columnist, reports on just what is being done in an article carried by the Washington Evening Star. She tells about programs initiated by the new Administration on Aging, the Small Business Administration, Mr. Shriver's own agency, the National Council on the Aging, and the U.S. Employment Service.

We are making a good start, but vastly much more needs to be done, Miss Porter concludes.

Because this is a challenge which will require increasing attention, I offer her column for the RECORD:

JOBS FOR ELDERLY—A TOKEN START

(By Sylvia Porter)

"Across the land," declared antipoverty chief Sargent Shriver at a recent hearing by the Senate Special Committee on Aging, "the American people are thinking about the problems of aging. America cares, America is concerned, America is dedicated to improving the lot of its senior citizens."

Are we? If so, exactly what are we *doing* to relieve the poverty that now hits one in five of the elderly, the forced unemployment through mandatory retirement, the massive job discrimination because of age?

A new Administration on Aging has been created under the Older Americans Act of 1965. It is supposed to be working up "a coordinated program of services and opportunities for our older citizens."

The Small Business Administration is trying to draw up a "national roster of retired business and professional men and women" to provide faltering small businesses with specialized counseling in a variety of different fields.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has launched a "foster grandparents" project which employs older Americans to provide desperately-needed "tender loving care" to abandoned and underprivileged children in orphanages and other institutions. As one worker remarked: "It gives me something to get up for in the morning."

The OEO also is helping to finance "Operation Green Thumb," employing retired farmers to help beautify our rural roadsides and countryside. Says an OEO spokesman: "Communities all over the country are just beginning to draw up plans to help the elderly poor—and to request antipoverty funds."

The National Council on the Aging has been developing and distributing models for a variety of part-time and full-time job opportunities and employment services in communities where the elderly are concentrated. The work is mostly in community and household services. And the OEO has approved plans for several "comprehensive senior citizen service centers" which offer counseling, job-referral, health and legal services, educational and recreational opportunities.

The U.S. Employment Service has trained and hired 75 "older worker specialists" in six major U.S. cities who will interview and counsel elderly job applicants and attempt to develop new local job opportunities tailored to the specific needs and abilities of the elderly. This effort is due to be extended soon to 20 U.S. cities.

The USES has, in addition, launched two experimental projects to organize special part-time employment services primarily for elderly workers—and to tap the services of volunteers who can help pinpoint suitable part-time jobs.

We have made a "good beginning," in the words of the just-released report of the Senate Special Committee on Aging. But it is painfully obvious that every single effort to develop jobs for older Americans now under way is on an extremely limited scale. It is a "good"—but token—start.

Vitamins and Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR CALLAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, a proposal has been offered by the Federal Food and Drug Administration to be effective 180 days from June 18, 1966, in which certain foods are allowed to be vitamin fortified and others are not. Milk is one of those food products in which vitamin foritifying is not allowed.

There are several views on this proposal. A recent statement by J. Gordon Roberts, president of the Roberts Dairy Co. of Nebraska, effectively presents one side of the question. The Roberts Dairy Co. has been a leader in the dairy industry for several years. I wish to submit parts of Mr. Roberts' statement for inclusion in the RECORD:

Our company was the first in the nation successfully to introduce vitamin D into fresh milk. A few had tried, half-heartedly.

Not too many will undertake a project of this kind, and take the inevitable back-lash of resistance to change. My own father told me that the American diet had been "perfected" with the advent of pasteurization, and cited authorities to prove it.

Prior to embarking upon this enterprise, however, we investigated the need for vitamin D. We found that an alarming percentage of children in low-income families were suffering from crippling rickets.

This was particularly true in the non-white elements of our society, most of whom at that time could not afford vitamin D by prescription. Nevertheless, we were accused of trying to be medicine men rather than milk men. The majority of doctors, themselves, however, supported us. Otherwise the product just would not have sold, irrespective of any governmental action.

At that time, though, I became convinced that the only protection against pressure groups in government within a democratic society is the right to tell the truth.

For pressure groups have always been active since the founding of the Republic, and apparently always will be. What such people might have done to vitamin D milk under the proposed regulation must be a moot question. But more about pressure groups later.

Today, rickets has disappeared almost completely from the American scene. But some of our finest athletes today might otherwise have been afflicted with twisted limbs. For our company successfully introduced vitamin D milk back in the early '30's, in the depth of the depression. Other companies of course later followed our lead.

Prior to the introduction of homogenized milk by Roberts Dairy, dairymen said that milk had always been and always would be sold on the basis of cream-line. And again we were accused of resorting to a gimmick, the nastiest of all words in nutritional jargon.

Actually, we were trying to make cows' milk as nearly like human milk as we could. We did not then, and do not now subscribe to the theory that cows' milk as it comes to the calf is an ideal food for human beings.

For example, the curd of unhomogenized cows' milk is the size of a walnut, suited to the four stomachs of a calf. The curd of homogenized milk is the size of a pea, and the curd of human milk is even much smaller.

Some people need milk with the milk-sugar removed, which is not being done very satisfactorily now. Many things need doing.

Although this may not be proved, it is our theory that as cows' milk may be made to approach human milk, human health may also improve. Such a goal may hardly be described to meet "special dietary need" according to the terms of proposed regulation.

So far as vitamin C is concerned, the amount of vitamin C is either cows' milk or human milk must depend upon the kind of food fed to the mother. At least one textbook comparison of maximum quantities of vitamin C, however, in human as compared to cows' milk, shows that human milk may be nearly eight times richer than cows' milk in this vitamin.

The well-documented fact that breast-fed babies have an advantage, on the average, over babies fed any kind of cows' milk indicates beyond question that cows' milk may hardly be described as ideal. But spelling out the difference in terms of "special dietary need" might be difficult. For who knows the sum total of such needs as a basis for comparison?

At about the time we started investigating the addition of vitamin C and other micro-nutrients to milk, highly fortified "reducing" foods were coming into vogue.

I asked myself, "Why should the benefits of vitamin fortification be limited to the rich?"

My experience with vitamin D milk made me feel that I might accomplish some good.

In a later conversation, a representative of the Boys' Clubs in Omaha described the deplorable teeth of many of his young charges from areas of economic disadvantage. I could not give away enough product to affect this problem materially, but I could help with the diet . . . and education as to need.

Our research indicated that many low-income family groups eat very few fresh fruits.

And many members of low-income groups suffer from very bad teeth. Yet, at the very least, vitamin C affects the problem of healthy teeth and gums through affecting general health. For vitamin C is "cement" in the body.

The need of elderly people, particularly those with fixed income, for a low-cost source of vitamin C in milk should be too obvious for comment. Many such people practically live on milk because of bad dentures, for economic and other reasons.

To our knowledge, there is no evidence that vitamin C, even in very large quantities, may be harmful to health in any way. And hazard of vitamin C shortage for the very young and very old may be found described in a medical textbook.

Research demonstrates that vitamin C is extremely important in overcoming infections, through attacking some bacterial toxins, as well as bacteria themselves, and conceivably some virus.

Outside of noticeably improving flavor, the value, if any, of protecting the milk itself through vitamins is not presently known. It may not ever be known if the fortification of milk with such a non-toxic, wholesome product as vitamin C may be prohibited. For indications are that vitamin C may feasibly afford added protection to the milk, itself.

The possible effect of vitamin C upon other vitamins in milk is not known either, but there is no indication that it may be detrimental. And according to a consumer survey, vitamin C does improve milk flavor, normally considered reason enough for artificial sweeteners with no nutritional advantage.

The following statement is supported by research as indicated:

"Some foreign substances, not normally a part of the human diet, may produce a slight or severe harmful effect. Yet the consumption of such 'foreign substances' (medicines, for example) may provide benefits that offset by far any conceivable effect of an undesirable nature.

"So far as the consumption of products not normally a part of the diet is concerned, vitamin C may tend to counteract possible ill effects. For example, for nearly thirty years it has been known that vitamin C may help prevent the toxicity, allergic reactions and shock caused by drugs.

"Such drugs as aspirin, the antihistamines, barbiturates, adrenaline, stilbestrol, estrogen, sulfonamides, ammonium chloride, thiouracil, thyroid, and atropine are considered to cause a continuous destruction of vitamin C as long as the drug is taken and sometimes for six weeks after it has been discontinued.

"The effect of even such presumably innocuous substances as fluorine, and excessive amounts of vitamins A and D may be minimized by vitamin C.

"Research indicates that smoking may tend to reduce the amount of vitamin C in the body. It seems reasonable that such would be the case, because such a pattern would be consistent with the general pattern here described.

"Moreover, the blood of persons with allergies shows an unusually small amount of vitamin C."

In researching sources of vitamin C, we were amazed to discover that many frozen fruit items contain little or no vitamin C at all.

We discovered that we could supply for no more than two cents a quart very substantial fortification to milk, including vitamin C and iron, and other micro-nutrients, which might cost a low-income family from one to two dollars to obtain through fresh fruits or by prescription. Moreover, few low-income families consult a doctor about a diet as a means of preventing illness.

It is our purpose to discuss specifically the virtues of vitamin C and iron, rather than B vitamins. In fact, it is not our purpose here to sell a specific product at all, but rather to present a principle.

In this connection, nevertheless, we believe that restriction with regard to B vitamins, too, should be based upon predictable damage to health, as demonstrated by scientific method, rather than upon unproved propositions. If dangerous, B vitamins, should be sold by prescription only, rather than by economic stratification.

However, according to one writer, a complicating factor in fortifying diets with B vitamins without creating a damaging imbalance consists of regulation requiring that some B vitamins be sold by prescription and some sold without prescription. Whether accepted as completly correct or not, this observation points out that the total diet must be considered in any rational appraisal of public health.

Today, prepared infant formulas provide additional B vitamins and niacin, as well as C and iron, much as does the fortified product we offer for sale. The need for this fortification in prepared formulas is recognized by the Federal Food and Drug Administration even in its recommendation with regard to new regulation.

Should such fortification at low cost be denied low-income families who must settle for cow's milk, such regulation may hardly be considered as other than class discrimination, whatever the justification.

There are at least three logical carriers of food fortification for wide usage: salt, flour, and milk. And milk is obviously the most suitable for wide utilization in the United States.

The carriage trade may presently buy fortified dietary food for adults in the form of "reducing" foods, almost without restriction, and with none suggested apparently. A "reducing" food is comparable to fortified milk, but sold at approximately $1.25 a quart.

By our own examination, such products are by no means perfect, and it seems doubtful that any ever will be. At least, our own efforts to describe a "perfect" food—much less produce it—encounter some difficulty.

In any case, a company selling food for approximately $1.25 a quart would, in its own interest, probably favor restriction upon any processor adding micro-nutrients at two cents per quart. So, little opposition may be expected from such companies against regulation in their own favor, even though the essential product difference here is one of verbal description rather than constituency.

Paradoxically, in proposing new regulations, the Federal Food and Drug Administration has offered a statement of intent which seemingly contradicts the declaration of adequacy of diet by definition, through recognizing the need for fortification to meet the requirements cited:

"The principle of the addition of specific nutrients to certain foods is endorsed, with defined limitations, for the purpose of maintaining good nutrition in all segments of the population at all economic levels . . ."

Opinion Survey of Residents of Bergen County, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, late last spring I polled the residents of Bergen County in my district on some of the issues currently facing Congress and the Nation.

Over 12,000 of my constituents in 28 communities responded to the survey, many of them sending along extensive comments with their cards. Students in 21 high schools in Bergen County used this poll as an extension of their studies in history and government by reviewing background information on the issues, compiling the results of the adult survey, and polling themselves on the same questions. This project provided a unique educational experience for the students involved, as well as a valuable service to me, and I was pleased to receive many favorable comments from the schools which participated.

The results of this poll have been distributed to the press, and will be circulated among the adults and students in my district. I believe they would be of interest to my colleagues as well.

The results of both the adult poll and the student poll follow:

Congressional questionnaire, 1966—Final results

	Adult voters			Students		
	Yes	No	Did not answer	Yes	No	Did not answer
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. Based on personal experience, do you believe that food, clothing, and other basic living costs have increased to the point where this should be a matter of national concern?	77	19	4	57	39	4
2. If Vietnam expenditures continue to rise, would you favor—						
(a) A cutback in Federal domestic programs?	65	18	17	36	53	11
(b) An increase in taxes?	19	38	43	16	70	14
(c) Federal Government wage and price controls?	30	33	37	40	42	18
3. To assist in solving the problems of the commuter, would you favor—						
(a) Direct Federal subsidies for operating losses?	17	37	46	30	55	15
(b) Formation of public transportation authorities?	49	27	24	56	30	14
(c) State and local tax relief for railroads?	32	24	44	27	58	15
(d) Tax credits for commuting expenses?	34	26	40	46	41	13
4. Should parents be allowed to deduct college expenses for income tax purposes?	66	27	7	83	13	4
5. Do you favor laws requiring carmakers to put more emphasis on safety?	72	23	5	80	17	3
6. Should the $1,500 annual income limitation on persons receiving social security benefits be raised to $3,000, the general income guideline for the antipoverty program?	78	17	5	51	34	15
7. Do you favor an increase in the minimum wage of—						
(a) $1.60 by 1968 as recommended by the President's economic advisers?	45	27	18	53	32	15
(b) $1.75 by 1968 as recommended by the AFL–CIO?	18	46	36	39	38	23
8. Do you feel you are being kept adequately informed by your Government on developments in Vietnam?	30	65	5	47	49	4
9. In Vietnam, should we—						
(a) Increase our military effort?	46	21	33	42	31	27
(b) Negotiate (with the Vietcong) and get out?	29	31	40	24	41	35
10. Should the Constitution be amended to permit States (with the approval of the voters) to apportion 1 House of the legislature on factors other than population?	42	43	15	26	61	13

11. What do you feel are the three most important issues or problems facing our Nation today?

Adult voters:	Percent
Vietnam	49
Inflation	37
Government spending	19
Civil rights	16
Welfare state	13
Foreign policy	12
Taxes	12
Crime	9
Communism	8
Foreign aid	8
Education	8
Labor	7
Poverty	7
Morality	7
World peace	4
Narcotics	4
Patriotism	3
Pollution	3
Population	3
Commuters	2
Students:	
Vietnam	78
Civil rights	38
Inflation	30
Communism	18
Poverty	17
Education	11
World peace	9
Foreign policy	9
Crime	8
Population	7
Foreign aid	7
Government spending	7
Taxes	7
Patriotism	6
Narcotics	6
Labor	5
Welfare state	4
Morality	3
Pollution	3
Commuters	1

National Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to our observance of National Drum Corps Week, during the week of August 21 through 27, designated as such in honor of the 1 million teenagers in the United States who are a part of this colorful and decent activity.

On this occasion, I am very happy to join with my colleagues in Congress to show our respect and admiration for these fine young people and to extend my best wishes to them for their continued participation in this meaningful and wholesome activity. The description, "an expression of order, color, symmetry, and beauty," accurately portrays the wonderful marching and maneuvering, the bugling and drumming in which these drum corps units participate.

Certainly this activity deserves the seal of "Juvenile Decency," as a clean, interesting, and inspiring activity for our youth. Unfortunately, in this confused world, where youth is struggling to find a place for itself and an outlet for its zest and energy, many of our young people get off on the wrong trail and fail to find worthwhile activities, ending up as juvenile delinquents or in the world of crime.

I am pleased to note the continued growth that this activity has experienced in the past few years, and hope that the numbers of our young people now participating multiply manifold in the future. National Drum Corps Week is aimed at bringing to the attention of the American people the importance of this youth activity, and serves as an encouragement to our youth and to the fine contribution they are making to our way of life. This movement deserves the cooperation and support of all Americans. The spirit fostered within these organizations adds to the spirit that makes this Nation the leader in today's world.

Milwaukee Journal Hails Nomination of Justice Thomas Fairchild to Seventh U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial on July 6, the Milwaukee Journal endorsed enthusiastically President Johnson's nomination of Justice Thomas E. Fairchild of the Wisconsin Supreme Court to the Seventh United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

I concur fully in the Journal's view that he is the "preeminent nominee" for the place on the circuit bench customarily filled by a Wisconsin man.

I include the editorial lauding the qualifications of Justice Fairchild:

A Fine Court Choice

President Johnson has seen that Justice Fairchild of the Wisconsin supreme court is indeed the preeminent nominee in this state for the federal circuit court of appeals in Chicago, in the seat customarily filled by a Wisconsin man.

In judicial career terms it is distinctly a promotion, even from a state's highest court where Fairchild was next in line to be chief justice. The federal circuit bench is the second highest in the land, with great power and prestige, overrulable only by the United States supreme court. The position has the added advantages of a $33,000 annual salary for life and security against having to compete in elections.

The occasion for congratulations should not pass, however, without an embarrassing reminder that Wisconsin has persisted in treating Justice Fairchild shabbily in the matter of pay, through a defect in the constitution which the voters have twice refused to correct. This left him stuck with the lowest salary on the court through a 10 year term during which newer members received good sized and needed raises.

There will almost certainly be another opportunity to make this correction, perhaps as early as next April.

Doctors and Medicare Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as we enter a great new era of medical care for the elderly, it is disturbing to read that many doctors intend to bill their patients directly instead of the appropriate medicare agent.

This could work a real hardship on the poor. And as an editorial in the Washington Daily News points out, full payment of a substantial bill might be impossible.

Dr. James Z. Appel, retiring president of the American Medical Association, has reminded doctors that their first concern must remain with the patient. Any other policy would invite hostility.

The editorial in the News says patients with the means to pay and wait for reimbursement could be asked to do so. But it warns that doctors will be making a great mistake if they insist on payment from those who can't really manage it.

I hope to emphasize this warning by placing the editorial in the Record:

[From the Washington Daily News, June 27, 1966]

Doctors and Medicare Bills

It already is apparent, as the American Medical Association convention gets under way in Chicago, that many of the doctors hope to shed some of the paperwork involved in Medicare by billing patients directly.

This would mean the patient would have to fork over the whole of the bill and then seek reimbursement from Medicare.

For patients who really are poor, this could work a genuine hardship. If the doctor's fee was of any size, full payment by the patient, even if prompt reimbursement were promised, might be impossible.

Under the law, the doctors have a choice. For instance, on a $300 fee (nominal for a major operation) the patient in any event would have to pay the first $50 plus 20 percent of the balance or a total of $100. Digging up the whole $300 might be rough.

In his swan song as retiring president of the AMA Dr. James Z. Appel told the delegates their first concern, as always, must be with the patient, regardless of what they think about Medicare. He said any other policy would "invite hostility" from most people—and so it would.

Extra paperwork, admittedly, would be burdensome to a busy doctor. But it also is burdensome to the patient, especially the elderly of scanty resources. Patients who can afford to pay a total fee and wait for reimbursement from the Government properly could be asked to do this; but the doctors will be making a great mistake if they insist on such a system for those who can't readily manage it.

GOP Defense Study Idea Is Timely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times on July 11, 1966, commented editorially on the proposal other minority members of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and I have made for a blue-ribbon commission to study our national defense policy.

In expressing support for such a study, the Times said:

> There is room for legitimate concern about America's long-range defense posture, and uneasiness on this score has been expressed by the Times on past occasions.

It stated that such a high-level study would be in the public interest.

The Los Angeles Times also on July 11 in an article by staff writer Ted Sell discusses various far-reaching and in-depth questions that have been raised concerning vital aspects of our defense planning policy. They are questions which give rise to the proposal for a commission on national defense policy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the Record the editorial and article:

GOP Defense Study Idea Is Timely

Republican members of the House defense appropriations subcommittee propose that a "blue ribbon commission" be created to study basic U.S. defense policies.

A resolution to this effect has been introduced by Rep. Glen Lipscomb (R-Los Angeles), ranking Republican on the subcommittee.

There is room for legitimate concern about America's long-range defense posture, and uneasiness on this score has been expressed by the Times on past occasions.

A high-level study by a group of distinguished citizens, therefore, would indeed be in the public interest—provided it is not used as a vehicle for partisan politics, or for congressional attempts to "get" Defense Secretary Robert McNamara.

The GOP lawmakers are worried on several counts.

In recent years, they say, weapons development and other defense decisions have been influenced more by a benevolent reading of Soviet intentions than by Red military capabilities.

The Republican critics see a reluctance by the Defense Department to move forward with development of a new manned bomber, an anti-missile defense system and military space vehicles—despite evidence that the Russians are "aggressively pursuing new developments."

Lipscomb and his colleagues are especially concerned about "the time frame of the 1970's"—whether defense policies of the past five years have failed to take adequate account of long-range security needs.

There is ample precedent for the proposed Commission on National Defense Policy.

President Truman's Air Policy Commission, headed by Thomas K. Finletter, made recommendations in 1947 that laid the basis for today's awesome American air power.

Since members of the proposed new commission would be appointed by leaders on Capitol Hill, however, there would be a strong temptation to name a group which would support increased congressional prerogatives in the making of defense policy.

That is, or should be, a separate quarrel. What's needed is a high-level study group which would not owe any special loyalties either to the executive or legislative branches—but only to the security of this nation.

GOP Fights McNamara on Policy Assumptions—New Criticism by Congress Study Group Based on Analysis of Basic Philosophy

(By Ted Sell)

Washington.—Republican criticism of Robert S. McNamara is nothing new. In the past it has been directed at specific decisions. But now, perhaps with the idea of staking out an issue for the coming congressional elections, ranking House Republicans have mounted an assault in depth on the basic McNamara philosophy.

They are now attempting to dissect the premises on which McNamara erected his defense policy and military force structure.

The new criticism, sponsored by Melvin R. Laird (Wis.), chairman of the House Republican Conference, and Glenard P. Lipscomb (Calif.) and William E. Minshall (Ohio), members of the House defense appropriations subcommittee, was contained in a lengthy statement delivered by Laird in the House.

POLITICAL BASE LAID

Laying a small political base for November campaigns against the Democratic administration—in the face of continued Republican protestations of general support for U.S. military policy as it relates at least to Vietnam—Laird prefaced his presentation with the declaration:

"Obviously, if the secretary of defense did not accurately and adequately personify administration thinking in this vital area, he would not be secretary of defense."

From there, the GOP group went on to declare that McNamara's defense policies have been based on foreign policy assumptions which may be faulty.

In effect, the Republicans borrowed McNamara's own technique, used in presenting his annual budget request to Congress.

POSTURE STATEMENT

McNamara precedes his request with a "posture statement" outlining in detail (more than 100 pages usually) the world situation as it relates to the United States. These statements are usually hailed as masterful outlines of foreign policy, considered by many Washington observers to be superior to anything turned out by the State Department.

But what, ask the Republicans, if the foreign policy presentation is not accurate; what if its analysis of potential threats is incorrect?

"The defense structure of any nation," the GOP group declared, "is determined by that nation's foreign policy. The secretary of defense has said that the development of our defense structure should be guided by U.S. foreign policy.

"With this principle there is no disagreement.

"Yet we do disagree with much that is being done in the defense establishment today especially in those areas that directly affect our present ability (Vietnam) and our long-range policy to deter potential aggressors.

"It follows, then, that our basic disagreements derive in part from basic foreign policy assumptions of the current administration and in part from the assumptions the secretary of defense uses to justify his force structure projections."

CHANGES LISTED

The Republicans suggest that several changes have been made in foreign policy assumptions since the Democrats took over in 1961.

These, the GOP group says, include:

1—A changed U.S. attitude toward the cold war which has resulted in a different assessment of both the current and future threat to the United States.

2—Because of this altered attitude, there has been a corresponding change of view about the desirability or necessity of pursuing advanced weapons development as vigorously as possible (and by implication, as vigorously as did the preceding Republican administration, the advanced developments of which are still coming into operational use while few weapons inaugurated under the Democratic post-1961 administration are yet seeing use).

3—Also because of the changed attitude toward the cold war, there has been a shift in decisions on which defense planning should receive priority.

ASSUMPTION HIT

Democratic defense policy, the GOP group says, results from an assumption that there has been a reduction in tension between the free world and the Communists, except for China.

This assumed reduction, the GOP charges, is based on two other assumptions about the Communists—that nuclear war is as unthinkable to them as to us; that the threat from them to the free world has been eased and that a U.S. attempt to maintain decisive superiority over the Communists might reverse this process.

McNamara's policy, according to the Republicans, has been to keep U.S. defense strong enough to meet visible Communist threats in the realm of potential Communist nuclear war and large enough to exert "crisis control" in nonnuclear-war areas such as Vietnam.

The GOP study suggests that the assumption that U.S. efforts to push advanced and potentially decisive weapons development would result in increasing tensions has stultified research and production of weapons such as antiballistic missile missiles, new manned interceptors and advanced manned bombers.

McNamara's effort to hold down defense costs leads him to push defenses, the study indicates, only against visible threats—those known to exist or solidly reported by intelligence sources as existing or potentially existing.

But, the studies ask, what if not all the threats are visible?

"We believe that our military force structure," the GOP study says, "should not be related to the 'visible' threat but rather to the capabilities of the Communists and to the fulfillment of our own national objectives."

McNamara's policies, the group charges, amount to a "reactive" approach instead of an "initiative" one.

"We believe that the strategy of response both with regard to crisis situations and with respect to weapons development should give way to a strategy of initiative. We would define a 'strategy of response' as one in which this nation permits a situation to become so serious that it must take extraordinary steps even to return to the status quo, and a 'strategy of initiative' as one in which this nation when it first sees the possibility of a situation developing will take steps to prevent its becoming a crisis situation either with respect to potential conflicts or to new advances in weapons development."

"Mr. McNamara," the report says at one point, "has committed himself and the United States as well to an essentially defensive and reactive philosophy."

This philosophy, according to the Republicans, may encourage China, the greater threat.

Strong U.S. moves in the Atlantic Alliance as well as maintenance of nuclear forces there, the report says, apparently have convinced Russia that military moves against Western Europe are not worth the risks.

"The same situation does not pertain in the Far East . . .," the report says.

"Piecemeal response" by the United States in Vietnam has only encouraged China, the GOP study suggests.

Continued Chinese success, without U.S. retaliation, may even encourage the Soviet Union in supporting similar wars of national liberation, in the GOP logic.

"In such a circumstance, American defense policymakers must ask themselves whether American conventional (i.e., nonnuclear) forces, no matter how mobile and how large, will in the end be sufficient to meet the variety of threats the Soviet and Chinese Communists doctrine of 'wars of national liberation' can create,'" the report declares.

From the philosophical basis, the Republican group proceeds to criticize McNamara decisions on specific defense programs.

Hanoi, Haiphong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. N. NEIMAN CRALEY, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1966

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor printed an article from the Economist, published in London, concerning the recent decision to bomb the oil tanks near Hanoi and Haiphong. The article is an excellent summary of opinion from another part of the world as well as a full account of the ramifications of this bombing, the effects upon China and Russia, the response we can expect from each of these nations. I should like to include this article in the RECORD as I believe it a valuable and informative commentary on these aspects of our military actions in Vietnam:

HANOI, HAIPHONG

Most people in Britain will regret that the United States has found it necessary to bomb the oil tanks on the fringes of Hanoi and Haiphong. It is a geographical extension of the war, though not in any real sense an escalation of the level of it; and it is bound to have killed a number of civilians.

Each new act of war, by either side, is something most people would prefer not to have happened. But for all that it was premature of Mr. Wilson to dissociate himself from the American action before he was in a position to judge its effects. Other people will prefer to wait for the results and then make up their minds on the basis of Mr. Wilson's own support for the general American position in Vietnam. It is the Americans who have offered to talk without conditions. It is the North Vietnamese who have refused to talk. [The extension of the] bombing will probably not shift the leaders of North Vietnam out of this refusal any more than the original decision to start bombing the north 16 months ago did. So it does not serve a political purpose. But it may serve a military purpose; and it is against this test that it will be judged. . . .

The military argument for a strike against North Vietnam's oil storage tanks is that transport down the Ho Chi Minh trail has become increasingly mechanised and therefore dependent on oil. A diminution of traffic along the trail would be a considerable help to the American and South Vietnamese troops fighting in the south. Since the tanks in Hanoi and Haiphong are some way from the urban area (on the other side of the Red river, in Hanoi's case) it should have been possible, by accurate bombing and the risk of heavier American casualties that this entails, to keep down the loss of civilian life.

This is the double test. If events show that the operation has cut the flow of supplies to the south, and if photographs show that the bombing was reasonably accurate, there will be no cause for dissociation except on the part of those who would not mind a communist victory in Vietnam. If those two tests are met, the Americans will have been following exactly the same restrained and relatively humane bombing policy as they followed in the second world war—when the British were burning cities.

The new American strike is unlikely to have much effect on the international aspects of the struggle in Vietnam. The Chinese will protest, and they may use the occasion to offer anti-aircraft units for the defence of Hanoi and Haiphong. But China still probably wants to avoid a direct confrontation with the United States. The North Vietnamese leaders are no more anxious than before to have a Chinese military presence around their capital; they would probably prefer some more Russian missiles. Nor is it likely—so long as the new bombing does not amount to obliteration tactics à la Bomber Command—that it will be the straw that breaks the back of coexistence between Russia and America.

The Russians honestly detest what the Americans are doing in Vietnam. But their relations with the United States are built on a hard sub-stratum of self-interest that is unlikely to be eroded by anything less than the prospect of seeing a fellow communist state pass under non-communist control. The Americans have no designs on North Vietnam. Their maximum aim is to preserve the independence of South Vietnam.

The action against Hanoi and Haiphong came after long deliberation. Even on [the eve of the bombing] the State Department said no decision had been taken. It now remains to be seen whether it can produce the results expected from it in shortening the war. If it does, then it will have been worth while. Mr. Wilson's statement put the action in perspective. If there really is a difference between the British and American governments over this question it is a tactical difference. No more than when Mr. Attlee flew to Washington during the Korean war does it mean dissociation on Britain's part from the objectives of American policy.—The Economist (London)

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week by the American people. It is a week dedicated to note the yearning for freedom and independence in the hearts of the peoples of Eastern Europe.

The bonds which unite us with these people are strong. But it is difficult for us in these United States to comprehend fully what it means to live without the basic freedoms that are so much an integral part of our way of life—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom to worship as one pleases.

But I am convinced that the desire of man to be free will ultimately prove more powerful than brute force.

Ireland gives the world an example of a country that for 800 years never relinquished her zeal and determination to be free and independent. As a boy I well remember the many tales told to me by my late grandfather Charles McCarthy, a native of County Cork, Ireland, of those eight centuries of oppression. Although denied their religion, their language, their customs, their rights, these courageous people never lost the love of freedom of independence that their tenacity and determination finally won for them.

Freedom, indeed, is the wave of the future.

The peoples of Eastern Europe have not lost their spirit or yearning for freedom. In East Germany in 1953 and in Poland and Hungary in 1956, these courageous people dramatically showed the world their valiant determination to live under governments responsive to their needs and wishes.

And even more recently, we have learned of Rumania's attempts to introduce some flexibility in the tightly controlled eastern bloc and Warsaw Pact. In many of the other satellite states including Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and East Germany one can find signs of a deep yearning for peace, freedom and independence.

Just this week we learned of sharp differences between the Soviet Union and its satellites over fuel and raw materials. The Eastern European countries are convinced that the Soviet Union is charging them excessive prices for these goods. The Soviet Union has taken cognizance of this situation, and Soviet economist I. Dudinsky has even broadly suggested that the Eastern European countries would do well to begin looking toward Asia, Africa, and Latin America for much of their future increased raw material and fuel needs.

Czechoslovakia recently expressed its belief that it pays almost twice as much for Soviet oil as does Italy.

Some observers believe that this squabbling could forecast the eventual end of the Communist economic bloc and perhaps even the dissolution of the Comecon.

Western sellers of raw materials and fuel may have new opportunities for sales to Eastern European countries on a scale never before considered possible.

There are many other indications that the United States and the other Western nations can assist the movement toward independence in the Eastern European countries by increased trade, cultural exchanges, tourism and moral encouragement. These, in my view, are the best ways for us to encourage the freedom and independence of the present Soviet satellites.

Knowledge Is To Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. RONAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News finds good reasons for public support of President Johnson's call for a reexamination of priorities in medical research.

In instructing the Government's top medical men to conduct such a study, the newspaper says, the President was merely calling attention to the need for balance beween discovery and application in the science of life and health.

The President made this statement:

> We must make sure that no life-giving discovery is locked up in our laboratory.

For this he may be assailed as anti-intellectual or unscientific, the News says in an editorial. But it contends the American people who foot the multi-billion-dollar research and development bills are not likely to find him at fault.

My colleagues may want to read the entire editorial, so I include it in the Record:

[From the Chicago Daily News, July 2, 1966]

KNOWLEDGE IS TO USE

The President has instructed the government's top medical men to re-examine their priorities to determine whether too much energy is being spent on basic research and not enough on translating laboratory findings into tangible benefits for the American people.

The President was merely calling attention to the need for a sensible balance between discovery and application in the sciences of life and health. The disinterested quest for knowledge is one of the wellsprings of science and it can be muddied by short-sighted grubbing for immediate returns. But another wellspring of knowledge is the desire to put it to use and it can get clogged if not enough work is done to process and apply the new knowledge that accumulates at a compounding rate.

"Knowledge is power," Francis Bacon said. But knowledge and power do not exist in the abstract. Knowledge is what individuals know and power is what individuals and groups are able to employ. Is something "known" if it merely exists somewhere in a file and not in the ward or operating room or outpatient clinic where it is needed?

"We must make sure that no life-giving discovery is locked up in our laboratory," the President said. For this he may be assailed as being "anti-intellectual" or "unscientific" but the American people, who foot the $16 billion research and development bills, are not likely to find him at fault.

Things Are Looking Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the Houston Chronicle has surveyed the current world situation and found things are looking up almost everywhere.

And why?

> The big answer to that question is the strong action this country is taking in Vietnam—

The newspaper says.

If the United States had not acted, the Chronicle contends, the Vietcong and North Vietnamese would have conquered the whole country. Laos would be under Red control. Cambodia would be a full-fledged vassal of Red China. Thailand would be under immediate threat, if not seriously infiltrated. India and Pakistan would be quaking in their boots. Indonesia might be under Red rule, and Malaysia conquered.

In this hemisphere, the newspaper credits our move in the Dominican Republic last year with an apparent abatement of the Communist threat.

There are still trouble spots, of course. But as the newspaper says in an editorial which I offer for the Record, they represent less danger than a few months or a year ago:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, July 8, 1966]

THINGS ARE LOOKING UP

As one surveys the current world situation he cannot fail to note that things are looking up for the free world almost everywhere.

The capacity of the communist giants, the Soviet Union and Red China, to stir up trouble obviously has decreased due to serious internal problems and the strain upon their economies imposed by foreign expenditures.

The forces of freedom are making significant gains in the Viet Nam war.

While France has withdrawn from NATO, the other members are in a mood to solidify the alliance. And France no doubt would side with the West in a showdown, in or out of NATO.

Why are things looking better? The big answer to that question is the strong action this country is taking in Viet Nam. If anyone doubts that, let him consider what would have happened if the United States had not vastly increased its forces there and shifted from its advisory role to active prosecution of the war in partnership with the South Vietnamese.

By now, no doubt, the Viet Cong terrorists and the North Vietnamese invaders would have conquered the whole country. Laos also would be completely under Red control. Cambodia would be a full-fledged vassal of Red China if not entirely occupied by communist troops.

Thailand would be immediately threatened by now, if not seriously infiltrated.

India and Pakistan would be quaking in their boots at the prospect of vassalage to Red China. Indonesia might be under Red rule and Malaysia conquered.

Instead, the enemy forces have been severely punished, Thailand is growing stronger and progress is being made against the Reds in Laos. Indonesia has turned westward following failure of a Red coup and the massacre of most of its Communists.

Our strong stand in Asia also has heartened our European allies, however much some of them publicly deplore it. Certainly if we had not stood fast there the Europeans would wonder whether they could depend upon us in a crisis.

It no doubt has contributed to Africa's relative stability of late, although there the major factor may be the failure of Russia and Red China to deliver on promised aid.

In our own hemisphere also the communist threat seems to be abating. Here again strong action by this nation must be given most of the credit, not so much in Viet Nam as in the Dominican Republic where a Red takeover was averted by prompt action several months ago.

There are trouble spots, to be sure, but in general they present less danger than a few months or a year ago.

NAACP Resolution on Rhodesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has a long and distinguished history of working to secure equal rights for all men. Their concern has been not only for the Negro citizens of our own country, but for black men all over the world who have been denied their political rights.

At its recent convention in Los Angeles, the NAACP passed a resolution which voices concern over the situation in Rhodesia, where a minority government representing 5 percent of the people seeks permanent control over the rest of the country's population.

Mr. Speaker, several times I have stressed the danger of the Rhodesian situation and the need for vigorous action by the United States to deal with the problem. I am pleased to learn of the NAACP's statement on Rhodesia, and include it in the Record:

Rhodesia

By its initial declaration in support of Great Britain and its first steps to carry it out, our government recognized the gravity of the Rhodesian rebellion.

We believe those first steps were more symbolic than definitive. We believe, further, that the time is here for the imposition of any sanction within our power, short of intervention by the armed forces of the United States.

We urge an embargo on all trade with the rebel group which has seized the government of Rhodesia, including products and raw materials of every description. We urge specifically the shutting off of oil shipments and the enlistment in this project of the full cooperation of all companies and nations now engaged in the furnishing of oil to Rhodesia.

We believe, further, that there is precedent in both our past practice and in our national traditions and policies for lending assistance to nations which may feel impelled to launch military moves against the Rhodesian regime.

The whole world knows that the Rhodesian rebellion against Great Britain is based, without pretense or apology, upon the perpetuation of naked racism. The Rhodesian white minority of approximately five percent of the population has not only excluded the black ninety-five percent from any voice in government today, but had declared its intention to deny the black Rhodesians any voice "in our lifetime."

This deprivation, based openly and unilaterally on race, could precipitate a race war, whose consequences, if not its actual conflicts, would penetrate and poison every area of the world.

The black and brown peoples of the world have provided too much evidence of the falseness of the inflammatory doctrine of white supremacy to sit idly by while it is used as a spur to racist demagogues across the world and as a vehicle to oppressive power. Even under the handicaps inherited from a colonial system, the progress of the new African nations has already refuted the assumptions of Rhodesian racism.

Our country, the United States of America, can have no part in abetting the ugly business of racism. We must sever all economic as well as diplomatic relations with a regime of rebels—one dedicated not to the attainment of freedom from oppression, but to the imposition of the most rigid control, based upon the meanest and most fearful of grounds: the color of a man's skin.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges Believes Institutional Grants Essential To Meet Federal Responsibilities for Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, I included in the Record, information from three university faculty committee studies which confirmed findings of the Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee report on the conflicts between the Federal research programs and higher education.

In commenting on the statement, Dr. Christian K. Arnold, of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, urges the replacement of the present project-grant system by a program of stable, predictable institutional grants, as a way of resolving these conflicts. He calls attention to a recent editorial by Mr. Dael Wolfle, publisher of Science, which raises the question of Federal responsibility for more stable support than universities now have through the project-grant system.

As an additional reason for reconsidering the present project-grant system, Dr. Arnold warns that growing commercialization in the submission of project applications threatens the integrity of the system. He points out that some universities now have Washington representatives to see to their research grant interests, and that a firm has even been established which offers to write up proposals for a fee.

There follows below the letter from Dr. Arnold, Mr. Wolfle's editorial, and an excerpt from the July 14, 1966, newsletter of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges:

National Association of State Universities & Land-Grant Colleges,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1966.
Hon. Henry S. Reuss,
U.S. House of Representatives,
2159 Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Reuss: We continue to be impressed with the impact that "Conflicts Between the Federal Research Programs and the Nation's Goals for Higher Education" has had and is having as an aid in clarifying basic issues relating to the Federal involvement in higher education. You are to be congratulated for inserting sections from the Yale, Berkeley, and Cornell studies in the June 30 Congressional Record as a further means of keeping alive the important issues raised in your report.

Here in the Association we become more and more convinced that a basic resolution of these conflicts cannot come about through an extension or modification of the project-grant system but can only be achieved through a program of stable, predictable institutional grants that provide a wide degree of flexibility in their use by institutions. *Science* publisher Dael Wolfle expressed much of our reasoning for this belief in an editorial entitled "Stable Federal Support" in the July 8 issue of *Science*. I am enclosing a copy in case you have not had an opportunity to see it. You might wish to consider inserting it in the Record.

Another reason involves the integrity of the project-grant system itself. That system, as you know, has served us remarkably well during the post-War years to provide stimulus and innovative force to research and education in the sciences at the colleges and universities. Applied to what are essentially support functions, however, it leads to a growing entrepreneurship that increasingly involves the utilization of commercial aid. This has already resulted in the growth of a cynicism about the system that could eventually erode its usefulness even for those situations for which it is well adapted. You might be interested in seeing the marked item in our most recent *Circular Letter*. A firm has been established that offers assistance in proposal writing at $25 to $100 per job.

These are among the reasons the Association has sponsored the Miller bill (H.R. 13786) to establish a National Institutional Grants program. A program of this sort is very much needed to fully resolve the conflicts that your report defined with such precision. We hope to be able to discuss it with you at some time when your schedule permits.

Sincerely,

Christian K. Arnold.

[From Science, July 8, 1966]

Stable Federal Support

Has the Federal Government acquired any responsibility for the continuing and general support of higher education in the United States? The answer may be debatable, but the amount of federal money going to institutions of higher education has reached a level that makes it necessary to consider the question.

Federal assistnce provides research support, new equipment, building aid, library improvements, student assistance, and other forms of help to a college or university that can qualify. Other federal money flows to universities that assist federal agencies in meeting their obligations for training programs, demonstrations, assistance to other countries, and other services or action programs.

Despite important differences, the financing of all these activities comes in the form of individual grants or contracts that are made for specific purposes, for a limited period, without commitment for the future, and with some restrictions on use. Such funds have often had an emergency character and have been appropriated to meet needs that were considered temporary. The result is that a university often includes a substantial number of independently planned and temporarily financed extensions or "subagencies" of a variety of federal agencies.

This kind of financing is in marked contrast with the reasonably stable funds that colleges and universities have traditionally counted on for most of their annual budgets. State appropriations, student fees, and income from endowment, in varying proportions, have provided the solid core of academic budgets. Although none of these sources has been fully guaranteed for the future, all have been sufficiently stable to permit long-term commitments and planning. Moreover, the nature of these sources has encouraged prudent use of the funds. Income from fees and endowment can be used where needed most, and if not spent this year is available next. Many state colleges and universities receive lump-sum appropriations, and those states which require more detailed budgets usually allow appropriations to be used quite flexibly.

These more flexible funds now provide for about three-fourths of higher-education expenditures. The more inflexible federal grants and contracts supply about a quarter of the national total. The percentage varies greatly from one institution to another, however. In some it is close to zero; in others it is far more than half.

Higher education and the Federal Government have both benefited greatly from their financial and intellectual collaboration. The partnership will continue. But the amount of money now involved and its highly segmental character strain the ability of many institutions to plan and use their other resources most constructively, and these strains are most acute in the institutions that receive the most federal dollars.

The question therefore arises: has the Federal Government acquired a responsibility for contributing to the continuing and general support of higher education? The institutional grant programs of some agencies indicate a limited acceptance of such responsibility. But no general policy decision has been made, and no very effective one can be made by individual agencies. Decision at a higher level will be necessary, and that decision will be difficult, for constitutional, religious, regional, and educational issues are all involved in a matter of national policy. This whole problem is likely to become more vexatious before it is settled.

—Dael Wolfle.

[National Association of State Universities & Land-Grant Colleges, circular letter No. 20, July 14, 1966]

College-University Washington Representation Attracts Attention

Representation of interests of colleges and universities in Washington is the subject of an article in *The Reporter* for June 30, 1966, entitled "The University Lobbyists" and written by Mark Levy, who works for NBC News.

The article, generally superficial and frequently inaccurate, concentrates on representation of the interests of individual universities and colleges, university complexes, etc., by individuals stationed in Washington. The growth of commercial and semi-commercial organizations which represent institutions to the executive branch of government is touched on to some extent, as is that of associations of institutions. Leading commercial firm is Bell Educational Services, Inc., headed by Marjorie Bell, formerly Senior Counselor for Women's Affairs, Indiana University. Her firm is said to represent, on a retainer fee basis, about 20 colleges and universities. Associated Colleges of the Midwest (10 liberal arts colleges) recently established a Washington office headed by Ida Wallace, formerly associated with Miss Bell. The New York Finger Lakes group is also represented by a former staff member of the U.S. Office of Education.

Recent additions to the field are Leo S. Tonkin and Associates, recently established by Mr. Tonkin and Pat Nugent, both formerly on the staff of the District of Columbia's Advisory Council on Higher Education. According to the *Washington Post*, Mr. Tonkin, a former Congressional aide, said his firm will "help colleges keep tab on expanding federal education programs and cut through red tape to government grants and loans." Also new in the field are the Governmental Affairs Institute, which has announced the establishment under its wing of "University and College Associates" "as an aid to educational institutions and agencies of the U.S. and other governments" to be headed by Dr. Edgar B. Cale as President (he will also be a Vice-President of the Governmental Affairs Institute). Dr Cale was previously engaged in development work for the University of Buffalo prior to its becoming a constituent university of the State University of New York, and subsequently with University of Pittsburgh.

Still another in the field is Robert L. Gale, formerly Vice-President (development) of Carleton College and more recently with the Peace Corps, who has opened a Washington office as "Gale Associates—specializing in consulting with government agencies."

Civil Rights Under Communist Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TENO RONCALIO
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have long been in the fight for equal rights have been heartened by the progress made under such great civil rights leaders as the Honorable Thurgood Marshall. However, certain new leaders in the movement have shown signs of departing from the nonviolent policies of the past.

The use of the "Black Power" slogan is likely to do more harm than good to the civil rights cause. This vague term carries an unfavorable connotation, arouses fear of a new militancy, and sounds to some people like discrimination by blacks against whites.

I believe that an article in the July 15, 1966, issue of Time magazine will help provide a new perspective on the situation of the American Negro, and demonstrate to the militants that more is to be gained by pursuing the possibilities of peaceful change, where their predecessors were able to accomplish so much. The article points to the fact that, compared to Communist regimes, a democratic country is far more responsive to the demands of minority groups and is more willing to accept other groups into the society. This lesson is brought home by the experiences of those who defected to the side of the Chinese Communists. A comparison of the United States and China shows that avenues for peaceful change are open in this country and that progress has been made here.

This article is the story of a Negro who tried both communism and democracy and found that there is a better chance for equal opportunities under the latter system. This is reaffirmed by the great support which Negro soldiers have been giving to our effort in Vietnam, as I was able to witness them during a recent tour of that country. Many African students who studied in Moscow also found that the adoption of communism does not mean the abolition of inequalities but only makes it harder for disaffected groups to dissent.

Under unanimous consent I place this item in the Record, for, as a friend of those who are struggling to provide equal opportunities for all our people, I hope some of the present civil rights leaders will see the wisdom of revising their "Black Power" policy, which has only been eroding the support of their cause:

Defectors

By mutual consent—

Communist China and the American defectors it wooed after the Korean War seem to have sadly disappointed each other. Of the 21 defectors, a dozen came back to the U.S., five took up residence in other parts of the world, and one died in China. Last week Clarence S. ("Skippy") Adams, 37, a slender Negro from Memphis who was captured in North Korea in late 1950, became the 18th turncoat to forsake the Communists. That leaves only two still in Red China, and Adams believes that one of them is about to leave. Said Adams, after arriving in San Francisco with his Chinese wife and their two children: "I think that they were as happy to get rid of me as I was to leave."

Constant Indoctrination. Thinks were not always that way. A Tennessee boy who had never been out of the state until he joined the Army at 18, Adams, after his defection, went to People's University in Peking for two years and Wuhan University for five, learning Mandarin and other Chinese languages. He met and married Liu Lin-feng, a teacher of Russian and the daughter of a deceased war lord, was given a job as a translator for the Foreign Languages Press at about $85 a month. He lived well by Chinese standards in a three-room apartment, had access to Western publications (including Time) because of his work. Despite constant indoctrination at every stage of his life in China, the great promise of China began to dim: "In China, the people are not free of mind. They don't dare conflict with the official view."

First, Adams discovered the emptiness of one of the promises that had lured him to China; racial equality. On two occasions, he got into scuffles over racial slurs. He also began to be stifled by the indoctrination and the joylessness of Red Chinese life. "The Chinese have no sense of humor," says Adams. "When you go to the movies there, you don't go to be entertained; you go to study." Starved for recreation, he began visiting Peking's African embassies "to hear music, to dance and to talk freely." The Chinese did not like it, urged him to break off contact with the Africans. When he asked to leave China, they quickly agreed.

A Rest from Polemics. Eighteen months ago Adams taped two broadcasts urging Negro U.S. soldiers in Viet Nam to put down their arms and return home to fight for racial equality, but he insists that " I never considered myself a Communist." Now, he wisely has little to say about the war except that "we have to find some way to solve it." After visiting his mother in Memphis, he hopes to get a job teaching Mandarin, lead "a quiet life" with his family. As for civil rights or antiwar demonstrations, he says that he wants no part of them. After more than 15 years with the Chinese Communists, Clarence Adams feels that he needs a rest from polemics.

Let's Have Some Lightning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I met with a group of business and industry leaders interested in Federal fiscal problems, at which time I made the following remarks:

LET'S HAVE SOME LIGHTNING

As much as some of us may disagree—and I do—with certain facets of his philosophy of Government, Chairman FULBRIGHT of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently expressed some telling observations about our Federal system. I refer to his series of Christian Herter lectures at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, during which he said:

"In a democracy, dissent is an act of faith. Like medicine, the test of its value is not its taste but its effects, not how it makes people feel at the moment, but how it inspires them to act thereafter.

"Criticism, in short, is more than a right—it is an act of patriotism, a higher form of patriotism, I believe, than the familiar rituals of national adulation . . .

"It is only when Congress fails to challenge the Executive, when the opposition fails to oppose, when politicians join in spurious consensus behind controversial policies, that the campuses and streets and public squares of America are likely to become the forums of a direct and disorderly democracy . . ."

To the Senator's conclusions I would add that when an enlightened and intelligent public fails to demand from the Executive and the Congress a strict accounting of their stewardships, then our campuses and streets and public squares also are likely to become forums of a direct and disorderly democracy.

The 89th Congress not only has failed to challenge the Executive—it has given rubber-stamp approval to most of the administration's Great Society programs. Moreover, it has done so even though we are engaged in an extended and expensive hot war in Vietnam.

While the administration and Congress have been marching down the Great Society's primrose path, the general public has maintained an ominous and—to me—incomprehensible silence about the tremendous proliferation of Federal programs. This has resulted in greatly expanded Federal spending, the acceleration of Federal tax payments, a considerable amount of inflation, and the utilization of manipulative budget devices to support the fiction that Federal spending is smaller than it really is.

INFLATION TO CONTINUE

I ask you, "what does all of this add up to?" While you may disagree with me on the interim results, I think all of us probably would agree that the eventual outcome will progressively encompass all of the following:

First, we shall continue to have price inflation, which may reach serious proportions in the months ahead. The demand for goods and services has continued to be robust.

I am told that manufacturers' backlogs of orders have increased substantially and steadily in recent weeks. An even more serious situation is the fact that the wait between ordering and delivery of goods is being extended with almost every order. Thus, it would seem to me that pressures on capacity to produce will remain critical for some time to come.

Moreover, competition in the labor market for skilled help is also increasing steadily. To the extent that industry is unable to hire competent workers, pressures on capacity will become more critical. So, we can certainly expect an unabated demand for goods and services which will result in price increases throughout the economy.

Second, we can expect a demand from the administration for a tax increase, which would be expected to ease the inflationary pressures that are at work in the economy and which would be used to finance continuation of Great Society and other nondefense spending. Of course, the administration has not told me when we may expect a tax message, even though I sit in the President's meetings with the leadership in Congress. I would hazard the guess, though, that we can expect such a request no later than next January.

However, we could get it before the end of this congressional session if the administration concludes that such an increase would not become too much of a political liability in the November elections.

Third, if the Vietnam war continues and there is further escalation of our war efforts and if the administration and Congress fail to exercise substantial restraint in the area of nondefense spending, we may very well see the administration's "voluntary guideposts" replaced by statutory wage and price controls, and I might add that except for a 1930's-type depression I cannot think of anything that would be more devastating to our economy than the statutory imposition of such controls.

In time of war, and make no mistake about it, we are at war, just as we were during World War II and Korea, no nation can afford to indulge itself in unbridled spending without running the risk of incurring irreparable damage to its economy.

And that is especially true in our free enterprise economy, which has made this the greatest Nation in recorded history. At least, until this war is over, we desparately need to stop trying to be all things to all men.

APATHY AIDS SPENDERS

So, I think the time has come when we must have dissent and criticism and challenge of the Executive by Congress. But, the only way we can have adequate and wholesome dissent and criticism and challenge is when an aroused public demands as much from the Congress.

Now, I did not come over here today to be purveyor of gloom and doom. And I did not come to give you a case of the jitters.

But, I say to you with all of the sincerity and feeling that can come from a human heart, we must somehow and in some way arouse the public from its lethargic unconcern for the state of our Federal fiscal affairs.

Just 18 months ago the administration made a great to-do and for weeks the press reported in detail the administration's efforts to hold the budget below the level of $100 billion. What was the result of that effort? I can tell you we are now well on the way to a $200 billion budget and with little prospect for calling a halt unless business, responsible labor leaders and the general public rise up in righteous indignation over the squandering of our tax dollars.

Together, GEORGE MAHON, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and I, as ranking minority member, have accomplished some modest gains this year for economy with our subcommittees—only to have our hopes bashed and our efforts overturned by either the full committee or the House.

Early this year, I initiated what is now known as the Bow expenditure limitation amendment. When applied, it would have limited the administration's spending in fiscal 1967 to 95 percent of what the President had proposed to spend in his January budget for items covered by a specific appropriation bill. You and I know full well that, except for defense, there isn't a single agency which could not absorb a 5 percent cut in spending without adverse effect upon its programs. But what was the outcome of my efforts—a resounding rejection.

After I tested the House and found no sentiment at all for effecting substantial reductions in requested new spending authority, I made repeated efforts and offered amendments which would have cut appropriations back only to the level requested by the President. These amendments were rejected too.

Let me turn now to some individual items which to me, at least, point up the need for a concerted effort on behalf of economy at the Federal level.

Every time the second hand of your watch makes a full sweep, it has cost us $28,000 just for servicing the public debt.

A few days ago Sargent Shriver, who heads the Office of Economic Opportunity, acknowledged that the administration's war on poverty program is expected to cost upwards of $40 billion in ten years. Almost two thousand years ago in the village of Bethany our Lord said: ". . . the poor you shall have with you always." Certainly, we should do for those who are sick and in need and unable to do for themselves, but I am convinced that poverty cannot be abolished by legislative fiat and the indiscriminate and often purposeless distribution of Federal largesse.

At least in Tennessee, representatives of the Agriculture Department have mailed post cards to local farmers, urging them to lay down their hoes and sickles, sign up for the cropland adjustment program and then go fishing—as their neighbors are doing.

In ten short years, the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has increased by five-fold from $2.1 billion to $10.4 billion and a leveling off of its budget still is not in prospect.

WAR GROWS MORE COSTLY

Our defense efforts in southeast Asia alone are now costing us $2 billion a month. These costs certainly will increase sharply as our war efforts are intensified.

On July 11 Secretary of Defense McNamara held one of his "economy news conferences" at which he announced a 30 percent cutback in the planned rate of air munitions production. At that same conference he announced savings in fiscal 1966 of $4.5 billion in defense costs. He also said that over the last five years since July 1961, he has managed to save $14 billion in defense.

Of course, Mr. McNamara is not doing any more in running a "tight ship" than would be expected of any good administrator, whether he be a businessman or a public employee. But, one thing the Secretary failed to mention were increased costs which he has incurred by the initiation of crash programs to meet our Vietnam war needs. There have been reported shortages of military clothing, materiel, bombs and small arms ammunition and the Department has had to "rob Peter to pay Paul" with respect to some of our military needs.

I will be delighted if he can manage to see the Vietnam war through to its end without accumulating the $12 billion surplus in supplies and equipment which were on hand at the end of Korea, but he has shaved our security might close. He cannot substantiate a good many of his reported savings, but neither can anyone else disprove them because they fall in the area of intangible speculation on what defense would have cost, had he not followed his course of action for the last five years.

In the five and one-half years that Mr. McNamara has been the Secretary of Defense, he has spent $266 billion for our defense and I cannot help but wonder why we were not fully prepared when the Vietnam war began.

The President has complained that Congress is increasing his budget for 1967 by more than $3 billion. After he made that statement I challenged him to veto some or all of the bills that exceeded his requests. To date, he has not seen fit to accept the challenge, but he will still have opportunities to do so in the days ahead. President Eisenhower vetoed appropriation bills which exceeded his requests and President Johnson can and should do the same.

I have chided the administration for sending Postmaster General Larry O'Brien and his legislative liaison troops to the capitol to do battle on behalf of funding the rent supplement program and the national teacher corps, but then failing to send them to help those of us who have been trying to hold the budget down to the level proposed by the President.

DEMAND FOR ECONOMY

So far this year, including the defense appropriation bill which will be debated today, the House has considered $97.9 billion of budget request for 1967. It has approved appropriations of $905 million more than was requested. That $905 million does not tell the whole story, however, because increases in spending authority, as contrasted to appropriations, and meaningless cuts in some bills have increased the actual total to $1.2 billion above the budget.

The House still has a total of about $17.5 billion of budget items to be acted on before the sessions ends. That amount does not include almost $14 billion of permanent appropriations but it does include funds for foreign aid, public works, a variety of education programs, the war on poverty, economic development and for a number of other programs. An opportunity still exists for Congress to effect some economies, but not much will be accomplished in that regard unless there is a demand from back home for economy.

If the demand for economy fails to materialize, I will estimate now that this session of Congress, alone, will approve new appropriations of about $145 billion. Of course, that $145 billion includes the supplementals for fiscal 1966 and the regular bills for 1967, but it is a staggering amount. Moreover, it will come close to the all-time record total of $147 billion which was provided in the second session of the 77th Congress during the thick of World War II.

Mark Twain once said: "Thunder is good, thunder is impressive, but it is lightning that does the work." I close with the admonition that concerned Americans will be well advised to generate some lightning in Washington with respect to where and why the administration, with the acquiescence to Congress, is needlessly dissipating the public's hard-earned tax dollars.

War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent three-part editorial review of the war on poverty in the Buffalo Evening News. I believe that these editorials fairly and justly review the gains and minuses of the war on poverty since the program's inception 21 months ago.

The tone of the editorials stress the ideals and successes of the program while at the same time emphasizes that the flaws can be rectified through certain structural changes, a sharper definition of function and assignment, curbs on political instincts and continued research.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert into the RECORD these editorials for all to read in their entirety prior to the scheduled debate on the Economic Opportunity Act:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, July 11, 1966]

TIME TO REFOCUS—WAR ON POVERTY—I

As the wealthiest nation on earth, the United States undertook in 1964 to accomplish something no other nation had ever come close to doing—the elimination of poverty within its borders.

President Johnson dubbed it a War on Poverty, and not too fancifully either, for a war of sorts is required to lick this ageless social problem.

The News has generally withheld judgment, even when scandals and other blemishes appeared, while this social war unfolded. It deserved a fair trial. Now, 21 months after its start and with Congress poised for a full-dress review, seems a good time to offer some tentative appraisals.

What has anti-poverty really accomplished in its first 21 months? Is it on the right track? What of its chances for success? Will we look back upon it in later years as a pioneering success or misguided blunder?

Our judgments start with a generally favorable impression of the Buffalo-area anti-poverty programs. They appear to us to be developing productively and they so far have avoided any hint of the scandals popping up in some other cities.

It is the national program, however, on which this review is mainly focused.

In our opinion, this national war on poverty is still falling short of achieving its objectives—yet not so far short as to blight its underlying idealism, or dim its chances of worthwhile success. And certainly we see nothing yet to justify an abandonment of the challenge.

The faults we do detect can be overcome—but they are serious enough not be blinked at.

What is the true scope of the challenge? Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the national anti-poverty agency, told a Senate subcommittee just a few days ago that 32 million Americans, or nearly one-sixth of our total population, live in poverty; that is, with urban incomes below $3100 a year or with rural incomes below $2200.

So far the anti-poverty program has cost $2.3 billion. It has "affected the lives" of 4 million Americans, according to Mr. Shriver's office, which claimed that by last March 1 it had helped 85,000 people find full-time jobs "in the private sector." To step up his war, Mr. Shriver wants $1.75 billion—up 17%—for the fiscal year just beginning.

The approaching debate in Congress will determine how much he'll get. Probably it will also mirror the confusion many feel about this poverty war.

Here are three general conclusions, or distinctions, which in our view may help dispel this confusion and refocus on necessary improvements:

1—Anti-poverty differs markedly from traditional welfare programs. In general they are passive; it is active. They merely guarantee the needy a minimum of food, clothing, shelter and medical care; it searches out the impoverished and their conditions in the hope of motivating and directing them toward productive, self-sufficient and rewarding lives.

2—The fight to crack the shell that hardens around the impoverished person consists of a three-step sequence—stimulating his desire to improve; harnessing that desire, through training, to a useful skill; and helping him find and hold a job.

3—There is no time like a boom-time—like right now, that is—to wage this fight effectively.

Under recession conditions, with the national economy contracting, it would be hard even to conceive of making major headway against the hard core of poverty. But jobs now are plentiful, employers are willing to take more chances in their hiring, to devote more cost and effort to retraining and on-the-job training. People with only marginal skills can find useful work. Now is the time to press the anti-poverty war with utmost vigor.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, July 12, 1966]

ITS FLAWS ARE FIXABLE—WAR ON POVERTY—II

The War on Poverty has probably churned more controversy per dollar spent than any other recent domestic program, which is why it is so hard to separate smoke from fire in seeking a balanced judgment.

Many of the countless anti-poverty disputes spring from the inexhaustible well of politics. Others flow from flaws of varying severity that mar the program itself.

A simple tightening of accounting procedures and administrative controls, for example, could quiet some critisism. In New York, Harlem's anti-poverty agency owes the federal government $290,000 in withholding taxes it apparently either failed to deduct or somehow lost track of. In Chicago, 27% of the 23,800 children in last year's Operation Headstart came from ineligible families whose incomes exceeded the poverty level.

Such flaws seem inexcusable, but could be quickly rectified.

The now-famous requirement that local community action boards contain "maximum feasible participation" of representatives living in the target areas spawned a controversy both noisy and powerful—yet largely political. Big-city mayors rebelled furiously, fearing this precept might upset hallowed political-social arrangements.

The concept itself is vital, however, because it involves the poor and their representatives in their own destiny.

Yet the anti-poverty program does contain serious flaws.

The institution is sometimes faultily structured. It often breeds inter-agency rivalry and confusion. This occurs because the responsibility for administration and for funding sometimes intermingles Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), the basic anti-poverty agency, with other federal departments.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps mixes OEO and the Labor Department, for example, and the work-experience program is administered through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

A sharper definition of function and assignment would clarify such fuzziness.

Rep. Adam Clayton Powell, chairman of the House committee responsible for anti-poverty, says only jobs, in the end, can eliminate poverty. He's right, of course, but jobs are the final step in an essential sequence of actions. Training must often precede the landing of a job. And before training, in many cases, must come an arousing of pride, hope and confidence. Something must stir the desire of the cynically hardened man or woman, numbed by failure or the rebuffs of discrimination, even to undertake the training that leads to the job.

While the full process of regeneration spans all three steps in the sequence—motivation, training, and job-placement— and embraces several agencies, OEO itself should generally concentrate on the first step: stimulation.

Much of OEO's success to date reinforces this impression. VISTA, the domestic peace corps, sends talented people into rural areas and city slums to advise and encourage people. Its contact is person-to-person and it thrives. Headstart, which combines education, enrichment and health for pre-schoolers, achieved striking success. Already the nation's first povery research center has been created at the University of Wisconsin.

This sharpening of the focus to determine what functions belong where is essential. It will illuminate what should be discarded and what conserved to make more effective this profound campaign to sweep poverty off our national doorstep.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, July 13, 1966]

Can't Afford To Lose It—War on Poverty—III

The United States can afford a costly crusade to wipe out poverty—even the $1.75 billion sought for the next year. What it cannot afford is to let the scandals, boondoggling and slipshod administration that have scarred this crusade in the past get enough worse to discredit it.

It cannot afford, either, the luxury of putting off incisive changes where experience shows them necessary.

Nor can it afford the public-relations euphoria exemplified in Sargent Shriver's recent statement that poverty will be eliminated by 1976 to coincide with the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. Such wild over-optimism invites disillusion.

The war on poverty even under the best circumstances will be messy, misunderstood, occasionally maladministered, stubbornly opposed—and long.

America will have to work at this war—long and hard—for it to succeed. Fundamentally the task consists of a three-step atcion sequence: Understanding the nature of poverty and motivating a man or woman to improve; linking that desire through training to a useful skill, and proper job-placement.

One reason for the snarled administration that has dogged the poverty war until now is that Mr. Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity sometimes strays beyond its critical function of learning about poverty and stimulating the impoverished to break out of their past.

Nearly half the budget request, for example, concerns three job-focused programs: Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps and the work-experience venture. In our view, these should go to the Department of Labor to be administered under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Further, a perceptive suggestion by Rep. Charles E. Goodell (R., Jamestown), that private industry be allowed to participate in the Neighborhood Youth Corps has real merit.

While the Labor Department should do the job-training, OEO, with its concentration on motivation, should recruit, screen, counsel and assign people into these programs.

The distinction here is important, we think, between specific job-training programs and those primarily concerned with stimulation and enrichment—broadly education. It is the latter which should remain the direct responsibility of OEO—including VISTA, Headstart, the migrant programs, and community action. And in the local programs, the principle of maximum participation by representatives of the poor should be persistently applied.

Among other changes needed to make the war against poverty more effective:

1—The special program for jobs in sub-professional fields, such as teacher and nurse aides, where an estimated 5.5 million vacancies exist, should be expanded. Medicare may even enlarge this job area.

2—Adequate funds for research should be provided, contrary to a house committee recommendation. It makes little sense to choke off well-informed analysis early in a battle no nation has yet won.

3—The Hatch Act, which curbs political activity by federal employes, should apply to all full-time OEO staffers. Poverty and politics shouldn't be allowed to mix.

4—A committee proposal to limit federally aided community-action salaries outside Washington to $12,500 a year smacks of political expediency and timidity.

These moves to tighten the administration, refocus its institutional structure and curb its political instincts would improve the anti-poverty program, not cripple or decimate it. Since the GOP opposition in Congress, while critical of some details, supports the objectives, strong bipartisan support should exist for positive action.

The flaws are fixable and they should be corrected now, because this anti-poverty war can do much to redeem the highest of American ideals—the respect for individual dignity and worth—if properly executed. It's a war we can't afford to lose.

The Importance of Social Science and the Need for Government Aid to Social Scientists and Liberal Arts Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the need for additional and continuing research in the scientific and technological fields. But too often the social sciences are ignored or slighted. This is a very dangerous state of affairs, for what good will it bring if we understand the chemical composition of the whole universe and fail to understand why or how men, alone or in groups, react to the world about them.

The social sciences are concerned with men—with men in society. The range of the subject covers all the inhabited areas of the globe and is concerned with primitive, developing, and developed nations.

It is well understood that our foreign policy can only be successful if we know with whom we are dealing and understand their attitudes toward life. Our domestic policy will only be effective if we know how it will be received in all sections of our diverse country and by all of our people.

Prof. Alex Inkeles of the Department of Sociology at Harvard University is vitally concerned with the future of the social sciences in this country and with the relationship between the Government and the centers of learning throughout the country. Today he testified before the Subcommittee on Government Operations of the Senate and presented his views about the need for Government aid to the social sciences, aid from other than the existing agencies. This testimony is concise and persuasive. It has good reason to be so.

Professor Inkeles is Director of Studies on Social and Cultural Aspects of Development in the Center for International Affairs. He is an expert on the Soviet social system and is coauthor of "How the Soviet System Works" and "The Soviet Citizen." He has done research within and without the Government, studying the developed and the developing nations, and has worked with many other American and foreign scholars. He is eminently well qualified to discuss this matter.

Under unanimous permission I place Professor Inkeles' testimony in the Record at this point:

Testimony Presented to U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Government Operations, Senator Fred R. Harris, Chairman, by Alex Inkeles, Professor of Sociology, Harvard University, July 19, 1966

The quality of the federal government's program for the development of the social sciences will be profoundly affected by its answer to three basic questions: (1) How shall we conceive the nature of social research and its purposes? (2) What do we believe to be the character and professional nature of social scientists and the professional social organization which provides the institutional framework for their efforts? and (3) What do we consider to be the appropriate form for relations between social science and other elements of society—its sponsors, its research subjects, its clients, and its audience?

SOCIAL RESEARCH AND ITS PURPOSES

Not only in the United State, but around the world, governments have had a hard struggle in coming to accept two simple facts about science—namely, that the greatest progress is made not by directing research to certain channels but by general investment in the scientific community according to its sense of where promising opportunities lie; and second, that a high level of investment in basic research is vital. Unless special care is exercised a kind of Gresham's Law operates, such that too much applied research can drive out virtually all basic research.

Many will question how far one can soundly identify social science with natural science. I for one feel that in respect to the issues of direction from outside and the balance of basic to applied research, the two branches of science share a common condition. There is good reason, furthermore, to state that in the case of the social sciences the federal government has been particularly inclined to give support mainly to "directed" or "program" research, and mainly to applied as against basic research. The growing sense of responsibility which the federal government has come to feel for correcting social conditions such as the extreme dependency of the aged, the poverty in many rural areas and the blight of our cities, commendable as it may be, has undoubtedly contributed to creating, maintaining, and strengthening the imbalance. Similarly, the growing awareness in federal agencies, especially those concerned with defense, that the intelligent conduct of our foreign relations requires the generation of large bodies of social science information has undoubtedly contributed greatly to further draw us away from the ideal balance of emphasis. It would be a serious mistake, of course, to assume that the large programs of "directed and applied" research never in any way contribute to "free and basic" research. There undoubtedly is a substantial spill-over or leakage from the former to the latter. There are serious reasons for asserting, however, that it is inappropriate and probably unproductive for our undirected and basic research to be funded so heavily on the basis of mere incidental spill-over from other sources.

THE ORGANIZATION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

In the natural sciences many great profit making corporations have established large well equipped scientific laboratories. More recently some corporations have been established whose main rather than ancillary business is scientific research and subsequent development work. The federal government after World War II progressively established a large and imposing network of research facilities of its own. Under the circumstances there is some reasonable element of rational choice in the allocation of research tasks in the natural sciences. When there is a practical job to be done along a particular line, the responsible government official may turn to any number of organizations especially equipped and eager to undertake the task. New programs of directed and applied research in the natural sciences may, therefore, be undertaken without deflecting the organizations and individuals engaged in basic research from their essential mission.

The situation is quite different in the social sciences. Other than a few well established agencies for the study of public opinion such as the Gallup organization, and to a limited degree the advertising research agencies, there exist almost no substantial commercial organizations effectively equipped to conduct social science research on a large scale. From some points of view this may be a good thing. But an inevitable consequence of this condition has been that the expanded government activity in social science research was exceptionally heavily concentrated in the universities, in which there were—or seemed to be—the necessary scientific talent as well as reserves of administrative energy. As a result the social science staffs of many universities have been flooded, some even overwhelmed, by the inflow of research demands from the federal government.

The consequences have certainly not been consistently positive. The initiative in the selection of the problems to be worked on has substantially passed from the hands of the social scientist himself to the agencies of the federal government in charge of the various research programs. Basic research has been crowded, sometimes crowded out, by the competition on the same campus created by the disparity in the levels of support for the different types of research. Once involved in program and contract research, professors and research directors find themselves obliged to meet deadlines and produce specified reports according to fixed schedules in a way any practicing scientist knows to be unreal and quite unrelated to the actual progress of living basic research. In order to meet fixed obligations, second rate personnel may be employed who would not ordinarily be invited to join university staffs. In extreme cases, a university may involve itself in large-scale programs which are planned, organized, staffed, and executed almost wholly without the direct participation of the regular faculty. This does not advance the progress of social science. Neither does it benefit the university, nor is it likely to get the taxpayer a fair return on his investment in social research.

ON THE RELATIONS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE TO OTHER INSTITUTIONS

The social scientist is above all a professional. This means that in common with other professionals he is encouraged by the tradition of Western civilization to accept rather stringent and special rules of honorable professional conduct, rules usually established by his professional colleagues rather than by outside agencies. Among the rules governing professional conduct, that protecting the sources of information, and guaranteeing the subjects and clients of the professional the most absolute integrity of treatment loom very large. Other important rules, or at least standards, commonly emphasized are that the professional should undertake no activity not in accord with the ethics and interests of his profession, and in the sciences this is generally understood to include the freest and fullest possible communication of all results and findings to one's professional colleagues. In the social sciences, furthermore, the fact that the subject of research is almost invariably another human being or a social organization creates especially sensitive issues. It is generally understood that research will be done in a way as not to exploit the subject of the research. Although codes of ethics in the social science do not have a long history and are as yet not well institutionalized, many now under discussion stress that the subject or source of information be told as fully and frankly as possible the sources of support for the research and the objectives which it is meant to attain. The information he gives is supposed to be privileged, and it is a breach of the moral code if it is used against him.

When social scientists are doing research for the federal government, some of these principles become difficult to adhere to. If research conducted in the university is classified, this of course, means almost none of the professional code enumerated above can be followed. When the research involves work on foreign areas, conducted at the instigation of, or under contract or agreement with government agencies, there are also substantial pressures to depart from the norms. Most obviously, a government official will support only that research he believes will advance the interests of the United States as he defines them. Those may not be the interests of the country or people being studied—at least not in *their* view—even if the Americans involved are convinced otherwise. Insofar as this becomes manifest, the social scientist is placed in conflict between the objectives of his sponsor and the self-defined interests of his subjects. Interests aside, the research may deal with issues which, in the local setting, are very sensitive. In some cases the mere fact that the United States government, and in particular its defense agencies, are sponsoring the research, makes it *ipso facto* unacceptable to important segments of the population and in some cases to the foreign government itself. This was the case with the recent ill-fated Camelot project.

The more there is sensitivity over such issues, the more American social scientists are tempted to be less than frank in the disclosure of the sources of their support and the ultimate purposes of their government sponsor, insofar as they know those purposes. When these breaches of trust are exposed, as they must inevitably be, trust is further impaired, suspicion is heightened, and future cooperation is rendered unlikely. Added to this is the sense of frustration that many social scientists of other countries feel about the terms of exchange between themselves and the Americans with whom they deal. The money and power, and often the research skills and technology are overwhelmingly concentrated in the hands of the Americans, who are therefore in a position to determine, local people often say *dictate*, the terms of research exchange, including the definition of the problem to be studied, the methods to be adopted, the staff to be employed, the reports to be written. The crowning blow in the view of these non-American social scientists is that often they feel the American, with all this power, lacks familiarity with the local scene sufficient to permit him to design intelligently or to execute effectively research which is really relevant and germane to his host country. Although this happens less often and in less extreme forms than would be indicated by some of the tales one hears, it happens often enough to be quite embarrassing.

Taking into account the more general points made above, I would like to propose some guidelines for federal government support of social science research. These suggestions rest on certain assumptions which it is no doubt best to make explicit. I assume that:

A. The encouragement of increased knowledge about foreign areas and the support of the institutions which generate that knowledge is a legitimate concern of the federal government, not only because of its value to operating agencies but as well to the Congress and to the American people at large.

B. The current levels of basic and general information about foreign areas is inadequate. This has been, I believe, a major factor in the decision of operating agencies of the federal government, including the Defense Department, to fund large-scale programs of social science research. In large measure this research has not been done intra-murally but rather through extramural research, mainly by contract or grant to universities.

C. The peculiar political sensitivity of social research, especially in the context of international tensions such as those surrounding the armed conflict between India and Pakistan, and our intervention in the Dominican Republic, makes it inevitable that such research, conducted under the auspices of operating agencies such as State or Defense, even if carried out by university social scientists, will be either unacceptable or will be viewed with hostility or at least great suspicion by governments, the people, and social scientists in other countries. As a result, the research efforts are rendered ineffective, and in the worst circumstances they may lead to international incidents such as that surrounding Project Camelot. This contributes to foster an image abroad of the United States as using its power in a ruthless and devious way to advance its purposes without respect to the interests and rights of other peoples and nations. It also contributes to develop the impression that social scientists are not really scientists, but rather are mainly agents or officials of government, and in the extreme case spies, posing as scholars to cover their real identity. The long term consequence in many foreign countries is to discredit, or at least to render suspect, all social scientists from the United States, or indeed, from anywhere else.

D. Within universities in the United States the extreme dependency of the social scientists studying foreign areas on grants and contracts from operating agencies has created unfortunate conditions quite apart from the strained relations with their colleagues abroad. These conditions include lost autonomy in the selection of areas to be studied and problems chosen for research, restricted freedom for truly independent criticism of government policy, and limitations on the free exchange of information and experience with colleagues working in the same field.

E. I do not believe, as many do, that these conditions have come about *primarily* because of extreme ineptness, political immaturity, or lack of respect for the academic community on the part of operating agencies of the federal government. There have been, and are now, numerous programs of social research supported by U.S. government agencies, including those on foreign areas and even some conducted abroad, which have been a contribution to social science and have not left behind a residue of misunderstanding. But on balance the results seem unfortunate, and the situation to be worsening. I believe the condition we now face results in good part from the basic pattern of support for social research on foreign areas which has been allowed to grow up spontaneously and without careful review for lack of a definite policy. It seems clear that the time for establishing such a policy has arrived.

In the light of these and other considerations which limits of time do not permit me to enumerate, I would like to present a series of proposals which I believe should guide our policy for support of foreign area research.

1. Federally supported basic research into foreign areas should be substantially expanded to meet the imperative need for greater understanding of all parts of the world, but especially of the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

2. The channels through which both current support and any future increments are directed should be profoundly changed. Insofar as possible operating agencies of the United States Government, and especially those charged with formulating and implementing its foreign policy, notably the Defense and State Departments and the CIA, should not be used as channels for the financing of university based social science research in foreign areas. This restriction should apply especially in regard to basic research, fundamental fact gathering, and descriptive library and field research. As alternatives the following should be considered:

(a) The establishment of a high level and maximally independent national research institute which would itself undertake research on foreign areas and international affairs. It might be modelled after either the National Institute of Mental Health or the Brookings Institution. Because of the inherent political sensitivity of this area of work, however, I fear that any such governmental organization would be ill-starred.

(b) The budget of the National Science Foundation could be significantly augmented with funds especially earmarked for research on foreign areas. The Congress might also provide through this channel for the creation within the universities of semi-permanent centers for advanced study underwritten by grants sufficiently large and long term to permit the development of significant programs of research and publication. Only recently a series of regional research centers on problems of education were established on a comparable basis. If the Congress saw fit, this might be done on a matching or contributory basis similar to that used in creation of the federal highway system.

(c) A separate and relatively independent fund granting agency might be created which would not itself do research but would rather have prime responsibility for fostering the growth, within universities and research institutes, of our national capacity for basic research in foreign areas and international affairs. The National Science Foundation might serve as a model.

(d) To adjust to the political sensitivity of foreign area research, which would apply even to a foundation on the lines of the NSF, it might be desirable to adopt a totally new pattern of federal support in this area. I propose the creation of a truly independent fund granting authority modelled after the University Grants Commission in Great Britain. Although created by and supported by the British government, the Grants Commission is not an agency of the government in the same sense as is the NSF. Its members are mainly distinguished scholars, but no longer actively connected with any university, thus assuring their impartiality in handling the claims of the universities for funds. The Commission is assigned to block of funds by the Parliament, which it in turn then distributes to universities and to programs within them. The Grants Commission, rather than the government, decides on the allocation of funds as between different competing programs, and exercizes initiative in the fostering of new activities. Administrative controls and the accompanying bureaucratic apparatus are kept to a minimum because the accounting is done in accord with the custom of each university rather than according to centrally established and administered procedures. So-called "block" grants are spent entirely at the discretion of the university which receives them. So-called "earmarked" funds are for the support of neglected areas, such as foreign research, but again the university rather than the government decides how to use the money to best advance the purpose indicated. In addition the British system includes a number of so-called Research Councils which operate in various special fields of research. These also are controlled by leading and highly experienced specialists in each field, who distribute to the university researchers the sums of money Parliament has allocated for various programs.

The new Commission or Authority on International Studies should receive a block grant from Congress, including sums now allocated to the research budgets of individual departments and operating agencies. In addition, funds in blocked currencies accumulated in foreign countries under PL480 could be administered to support foreign area research both by social scientists from the United States and from the countries concerned. The Commission would presumably be composed of men of the highest distinction, intellectual eminence, and personal integrity, whose knowledge and experience would give them particular competence to guide the allocation of resources for research on foreign areas and international relations. It could then operate much as do the private philantropic foundations such as the Ford, the Carnegie and the Rockefeller Foundations. Direct application to it could be made by university scholars, but at the same time the Commission might take more direct action to foster the development of existing and of new research centers and to encourage study of neglected areas and problems. But it would not be bound by the policy of any one administration nor the imperatives of any given operating agency. It would rather seek to foster the fullest development of knowledge and competence for research on foreign areas as a truly national resource available not only to the administration, but also to the Congress and to the people.

The universities and the scholars within them would be given maximum opportunity based on their special professional competence, to decide how to invest their resources and to concentrate their energies, rather than having those decisions made primarily by government officials in Washington. The result, I believe, would not only be greater freedom and less bureaucracy, but a larger and superior flow of information and ideas concerning foreign areas and international relations.

Placing responsibility for the award of research funds in a nongovernmental body guided by a distinguished and autonomous civilian commission would, in addition, free the government from the onus of responsibility for the behavior of researchers abroad, and would free the researchers of the onus of being agents of the U.S. government when they confront scholars and officials of other countries. Furthermore, it would permit a reduction in the scope of authority of the newly constituted review board for foreign studies which now, in effect, passes on the propriety of research conducted not only by agencies of the federal government but also by university social scientists who are supported by such agencies. I consider it a most dubious practice, however, that the problems a social scientist selects and the countries in which he studies them should be chosen according to the considerations uppermost in the minds of a review board of the Department of State, rather than autonomously by the social scientist in accord with his sense of what it is important to know.

3. Programs should be developed which permit social scientists from other nations to enjoy some degree of reciprocity in exchange for the cooperation they, their nations, and their governments extend to the scholars from the United States studying those areas.

This could be accomplished by permitting the new Grants Commission, the National Science Foundation, or whatever granting agency is finally selected by Congress to administer funds in this area, to make a certain number of research and institution building grants, free of excessive restrictions, either directly to foreign social scientists or to their universities. Alternatively, the funds could be given to U.S. universities but earmarked for the explicit purpose of facilitating their entering into cooperative arrangements with social scientists and universities in developing countries for the launching of joint research, as well as the exchange of research materials, students, and advanced scholars. There are numerous examples of outstanding success in such ventures, two known to me being the cooperation of Cornell University and the National University of Chile in the development of a program in regard to labor relations, and that between the Catholic University of Chile and the University of Chicago, to build the former's economics department, both programs, I believe, having been sponsored by the Agency for International Development. Such direct university to university cooperation is highly productive and minimally complicated administratively. It is most likely to generate a maximum of trust and good will which can be of great long term benefit to the foreign relations of the United States government.

4. Even if all the measures proposed above were adopted, it would probably continue to be true that some direct grants and contracts linking the operating agencies to the universities would be necessary for the purposes of the government, and might be desired by the universities and their staffs. Where such programs, hopefully kept to a minimum, are undertaken, I would propose they be guided by the following provisions and considerations:

(a) Classified research on foreign areas should in no case be contracted to universities, but rather should be performed either in-service or by contract with commercial organizations.

Even more important, the government agencies should absolutely be forbidden to use university organizations, or the names of colleges and universities, as cover operations especially abroad, for activities other than the announced and legitimate purpose of foreign area research. To create such cover operations is, in effect, to poison the wells from which we must hope to continue to draw the substance of our future research.

(b) The government should reverse its tendency to rely so heavily on university researchers for doing routine descriptive studies. Although university personnel may be able to do them better, it is a poor use of a very scarce resource to tie up the more highly trained and specialized personnel at the universities in such projects. They should be done either in-service, or through contract with commercial research organizations.

This proposition, like that in 4a, assumes that in-service facilities for foreign area research should be greatly expanded. While I would acknowledge that currently there are not sufficient commercial agencies to satisfy the demand, my confidence in the enterprise of American private capital leads me to believe that with the announcement and letting of contracts commercial services would quickly expand to meet the need.

(c) Research on foreign areas supported by operating agencies should, wherever possible, be limited to work to be undertaken in the continental United States and its possessions. I consider it undesirable that American social scientists should do research abroad under the more or less direct auspices of the operating agencies, especially Defense, State and CIA. This consideration applies less strongly in the case of agencies such as Agriculture, and very much less in the case of research institutes such as the National Institutes of Health. Nevertheless, if all foreign research to be conducted by university scholars abroad came through an independent scientific foundation, rather than an operating agency, it would certainly help maintain distinctions now painfully blurred.

(d) To compensate the universities for the deflection of their limited resources into this more applied research, each such contract or grant should provide as a supplement a fixed percentage to be given as unrestricted funds for support of facility development and basic research by the university. I would propose that a figure of 20% of the grant or contract would not be unreasonable as an initial goal for this supplement.

To sum up, then, I believe the national interest requires that the federal government provide funds sufficient to support research on foreign areas and international relations commensurate with the growing complexity of world affairs and the deep involvement of the United States in the system of international politics. In my opinion the best way to generate knowledge concerning foreign areas is to encourage more and more intensive basic research by qualified scholars in universities and their affiliated research institutes and centers. Such centers will be most productive to the extent that we leave to the scholars themselves, on the basis of their professional competence, the decision as to which countries and problems should be most studied at any given time. The direct participation of the operating agencies of the federal government in financing such research by contract or grant is not necessary, and is often prejudicial to the chances for acquiring the desired information and to its acceptance both at home and abroad. The Congress should, therefore, provide either through the National Science Foundation, or an especially created agency, for an increased flow of support for foreign research in which the universities and the scholars in them will have the main responsibility for further development of the facilities and the research which will provide the nation the breadth and depth of knowledge about foreign areas which it requires in modern times.

Fairplay Versus Law and Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, many of us and many of our constituents are gravely concerned over the recent ruling of the Supreme Court in regard to the questioning of suspects.

We all watch as the Chicago law enforcement officials do all that they can to protect the rights of the accused, yet we hear voices saying that the Chicago police should not have given out the name of the suspect, that they should not have termed the despicable deed the "crime of the century."

We cannot help but wonder whatever has happened to the idea of protecting innocent victims from those who would do such evil.

As all this controversy swirls around us, I would like to include here in the RECORD an article from the Mountain City, Tenn., Tomahawk, which discusses the Supreme Court's ruling:

[From the Mountain City (Tenn.) Tomahawk, July 13, 1966]

FAIR PLAY VERSUS LAW AND ORDER

The individual's right to fair play versus society's right to maintain law and order has been brought into sharp focus by a recent Supreme Court decision. Newsweek magazine states in a feature article that the Court's ruling . . . imposed sharp new limits on the police power to question suspects—a power lawmen claim is vital to convictions in four out of five criminal cases." The new rules provide, among other things, that after arrest police may not question a suspect until they have told him that he has a right to remain silent, that what he says may be held against him and that he is entitled to have his lawyer with him in the interrogation room. It is almost certain that according to ethical practice and "good professional judgment" the lawyers will advise their clients not to answer. It appears to many law enforcement officers, and with some justification, that under these conditions it will be almost impossible to ever get a confession.

Chief Justice Earl Warren, expressing for the Court the bitterly contested five-to-four majority opinion, states that, ". . . the . . . practice of incommunicado interrogation is at odds with one of our nation's most cherished principles—that the individual may not be compelled to incriminate himself." In his dissenting opinion, Justice Harlan stated that, "This doctrine . . . has no sanction, no sanction . . . It's obviously going to mean a gradual disappearance of confessions as a legitimate tool of law enforcement." Although, in general, law enforcement agencies across the country were apprehensive and critical of the Court's decision, opinions are sharply divided even among police officers and their closest allies, prosecuting attorneys.

Despite the Supreme Court's legal rhetoric and the debate which follows it, certain facts stand out. The rights of the accused have been further protected, but the problems of law enforcement have been vastly increased. This comes at a time when crime is increasing at a sharp rate—six times faster than population since 1958 and still growing. Last year, more than 2,600,000 serious crimes were reported in the United States.

But, as Newsweek observes, we are in a time of transition. There is developing a new approach, a renaissance in law enforcement procedures. Law enforcement has become a subject of major study for philanthropic and government research agencies. The Ford Foundation alone, ". . . has poured more than $5 million into police studies and education projects." There are such proposals as one for a "two-platoon police force" in which, "One group would handle matters requiring the sophisticated approach: social problems—like juvenile delinquency—and major investigations. The other group would do the manual labor: directing traffic, investigating accidents . . ." New ideas are being discussed relative to handling narcotics problems, alcoholics and homosexuals.

However, in the light of such developments as the Supreme Court's present ruling, some authorities feel that we may be moving too fast. Such laws may be too sophisticated to be applicable until our society has evolved to a little higher level than it has yet reached. Mr. C. D. DeLoach, assistant director of the FBI, has put it this way: ". . . to all those who continually clamor for more restrictions on law enforcement, I pose this question—Where will you turn for protection of your individual rights when you have totally destroyed the effectiveness of law enforcement?" This is a question that concerns every person in the nation. How will the new rules affect the rights of the individual, the morale and effectiveness of police officers, the orderliness of community life and the safety and security of every law-abiding citizen?

Monetary Deadlock: A Solution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the recent meeting of the International Monetary Fund's Group of Ten has highlighted one of the major problems facing world trade and economic abundance—the instability in the present international monetary mechanism.

As my colleagues know I have been long concerned with the state of the gold exchange standard—our present international monetary system—and its effects on world trade, particularly the U.S. balance of payments. It seems apparent, given the pressure on the British pound, and the continued deficit in our international payments, that some definite reform of the present system is not only advisable but imperative.

Therefore, I was pleased to find a very informative and timely article in the July 10, 1966, issue of the Los Angeles Times regarding the recent talks between proponents of two alternate international monetary structures. In this article, the major architect of President de Gaulle's suggestions for world monetary reform, Mr. Jacques Rueff, discusses with Robert Triffin—the proponent of the Anglo-American Triffin plan for international monetary reform—the present condition of the world monetary structure and various advantages and weaknesses of two alternate proposals to our present system.

I commend this article to my colleagues in the House, and if there is no objection I would like to insert it into the RECORD.

MONETARY DEADLOCK: A SOLUTION?

A week ago in Paris, two of the world's leading monetary experts met and talked—France's Jacques Rueff of l'Academie Francaise whose theories have inspired President De Gaulle's doctrines, and Robert Triffin, a Yale professor and unofficial adviser to high members of the Johnson administration.

Their joint fear: economic catastrophe on the 1931 pattern. And cardinally they called for urgent action on breaking the world monetary deadlock.

Triffin and Rueff agreed on the following propositions:

1. There is no present lack of assets, but an immediate and dangerous weakness of the international money system.
2. The Group of Ten has concentrated on the far-ranging problem of assets and neglected the search for remedies to this general fragility of the system.
3. Abandonment of the gold exchange standard in the future is vital.
4. Avoiding any massive liquidation of the dollar and the sterling balances is the first condition to avoid catastrophe.

Triffin and Rueff disagreed on the long-term problems.

The Rueff solution: reimbursing the balances through an increase in the price of gold.

The Triffin solution: consolidation of the debts inherited from the gold exchange standard without increasing the price of gold.

But both added a rider:

Triffin—If we do not agree on management of the fiduciary reserves, the re-evaluation of gold cannot be avoided.

Rueff—If we do not agree on the re-evaluation of the price of gold, together with the reimbursing of the dollar and the sterling balances, the Triffin solution is the only one that could prevent a world catastrophe.

Here, then, is how their talk went:

Rueff: Unless the international monetary system is reformed quickly, the world is threatened with serious disorder—not only monetary but also in the more serious economic and social areas.

Triffin: I agree absolutely. The most serios trouble spots at present are the recurrent crises of sterling and the dollar. A few years ago, an attack on one of these currencies helped the other because the movement of capital went from London to New York or vice-versa. Today, a grave crisis in sterling automatically engenders a crisis for the dollar, as well as in other world currencies.

Rueff: This situation is the result of the use, over an extended period, of the gold exchange standard, operating through, in fact, the dollar and the pound sterling. When the United States, for example, has a deficit, it pays dollars which are returned the same day to New York, where they are re-invested. The deficit therefore does not affect the supply of funds in New York; in this way the deficit can continue indefinitely. If this continues, we risk finding ourselves one day in a situation where banks refuse to increase their holdings of dollars and pounds.

Triffin: I agree entirely. Mr. Rueff has expresed, in a way to which I subscribe 99%, our two essential points of agreement. It is unhealthy to allow a country to obtain automatic financing of its deficits. And the element of instability which this entails in the long, even in the average, run is dangerous.

I would even say that we are already well into this situation. Even if America regains her balance, the sudden liquidation of past debts could trigger disturbances. Mr. Rueff was saying: this can happen any day. In fact, it happened last year. In 1965, the European countries, which until then had accumulated one to two billion dollars per year, liquidated inside 12 months more than two billions of reserve currency and converted it to gold. One notices mainly the French withdrawals, but one must underline that all the European countries—with the sole execption of Denmark—took part. France's share was less than 50%, the other countries shared over 50% among them. It is here that I underline with Mr. Rueff that we are in an extremely serious situation.

The present U.S. monetary position has been dominated by short-term capital movements. From 1951 to 1958 we received $1.5 billion of short term assets each year. In 1959, that is to say well after the reestablishment of confidence in European currencies, we received $1.8 billion. In 1960, we had about $2.3 billion of withdrawals—a turnaround from one year to the next of more that $4 billion. Starting from 1960 to the end of 1964 we lost an average of $1.5 billion a year of short term assets.

Up to the beginning of 1965, our problem was largely tied to the instability of the international monetary system—to the fact that more and more people are losing confidence in the stability of the dollar and were searching for other forms of investment: gold, investments in securities, on the different markets, plus investments in land or other assets.

TWO REASONS FOR CHANGE

The situation changed in 1965 for two reasons: voluntary restrictions cut the U.S. capital deficit, yet these measures applied only to American residents. To finance their investments, companies tend to borrow the money they invest in Europe, probably $1 billion this year. To face these new demands, Europeans need to repatriate some of their U.S. assets. As a result, we lose on the one side what we gain on the other. The export of assets continues, especially since the foreign assets in the U.S. amount to some $57 billion.

The expansion of military operations in Vietnam has also contributed to the deterioration of our balance of payments, not only on external account but because of internal repercussions. The economic boom that accompanies the war in Vietnam has led to inflationary pressures, which in turn adversely affected the balance of payments to the extent of $2 billion.

Anxiety may result from this—not only among speculators, but also on the part of central banks themselves—which may lead to some withdrawal of gold.

Rueff: Can one seriously base all the considerable weight of the international monetary system on the currency of two countries that have constant balance of payments deficits? This situation is truly absurd. It could easily be dealt with through the suppression of the gold exchange standard which produced it.

Triffin: The situation is all the more serious since the only operational agreement reached by the Group of Ten is that any reform of the international system must depend on an equilibrium in the American balance of payments.

'FUNDAMENTAL MISTAKE'

Rueff: There is a fundamental mistake here. To wait for the deficit to disappear before introducing a reform is to remain in a vicious circle from which we must escape one day.

The world has no lack of international liquidity: Both Mr. Triffin and I agree on this point. But the U.S. and the U.K. lack the means to keep paying for their deficit.

For the time being the real problem is hidden. This is serious for it has allowed—under the guise of general interest—operations whose unique purpose was to give the U.S. and England the means to pay for their deficits. All that has been done in the past five years, by raising quotas at the International Monetary Fund, the general borrowing agreements, etc., are so many ways of extending real assistance to the U.S. and England. These two countries have been allowed to offset their deficits without cutting their gold and foreign exchange reserves. I consider that this has been an unforgiveable mistake.

Triffin: One of the solutions that looks essential to me is the reinforcement of the commitments inherited from the past. The first problem to resolve is to avoid the world monetary crisis that would be provoked by massive withdrawals of gold from the system.

Rueff: This leads to the second part of our analysis, namely the study of remedies.

Triffin: The work of the Group of Ten is almost at a complete dead end today, caught as they are between the anglo-American standpoint on the one hand and the French one on the other: The other countries appear to be more or less divided between the two extremes. I do not think we should expect any agreement for another year or two except on two points, which Mr. Rueff and I would say are logically incompatible.

The first point is that we should not do anything until the balance of payments of the United States reaches its equilibrium. I trust that we both agree, on the contrary, that the U.S. deficit is a product of the international monetary system. It is absurd to argue that we must maintain a dangerous situation as long as the U.S. has not restored a payments balance.

The second point on which the Ten have reached some agreement is that the new international monetary system should be mainly or almost exclusively run by a dozen countries—the very countries that have proved in the past that their money was healthy enough. This is again absurd. The list of the countries that form the Group of Ten includes several whose financial policies in the past were not particularly healthy Even French policy, for a number of years, was not a model. Many countries today have strong doubts about American and British policies. It would be dangerous to insist on determining, on the basis of past experience, which are the wise and foolish policies.

Rueff: The best method for the Group of Ten is to define urgently their aims and policies—only thereafter could procedures be usefully discussed.

Triffin: The essential today is to protect oneself against immediate danger.

Rueff: The question now is not a return to the gold exchange standard. We already have it. The proof of it is that those countries that want to get some gold from the United States can easily get it. There is no question of introducing in any way a new system but only to get rid of the gold exchange standard which makes the present system inefficient and dangerous. People keep saying that I want to return to gold and gold alone. That is largely untrue.

The most rational solution, it seems to me, consists of admitting that although the price of gold was fixed in 1934 at $35 an ounce by President Roosevelt, all the prices in the U.S. have doubled, leaving gold far behind. If we accept the hypothesis of a doubling of the price of gold—and I am not against a smaller increase if it appears sufficient—the gold reserves of the United States, now $13.5 billion would be worth $27 billion. Obviously, such an operation could not take place through the signing of an international agreement fixing a simultaneous increase of the price of gold in all countries which have convertible currencies.

This solution would, of course, give rise to difficult political and constitutional problems in the United States, where my proposal has been so strongly criticized. During my last visit to the U.S. I met an extremely important senator. He received me very roughly and declared: "I understand your policy. You want to take all our gold, double the price and so make an enormous profit at our expense." I replied: "Mr. Senator, exactly the reverse. I advise you to double the price of gold so long as you have some left and to give us only half of the weight that you persist in giving us now."

Triffin: I, too, condemn the gold exchange standard as it exists now. But I do not think that one could improve the system by going back to the pure gold standard. Monetary assets throughout the world depend on a country threatened by civil war, namely, the Union of South Africa, and on the U.S.S.R., which provides on average the two-thirds of the new gold reserves which go to central banks each year.

Speculation and private hoarding have absorbed more than the western production of gold. Moreover, the decision in 1934 by President Roosevelt did not mean another golden age. As early as 1935 these accumulations resumed, and a year or even six months after the devaluation of the dollar the central banks figured: Now that the dollar has been devalued it will maintain its value some time, and consequently it is more interesting to make a yearly 3 or 4 or 5% profit on international reserves than to keep them in the form of gold that will bring no interest.

WOULD GIVE NEW VIGOR

Since an increase in the price of gold largely overlooks the danger of another immediate devaluation, this means that an increase in the price of gold would give new vigor to the gold exchange standard that we both condemn. The effect of this measure would therefore be the reverse of what we hope for.

I believe that before any reevaluation of gold we must come to a world agreement on the clearing out of the currencies from the international reserve system, except for the necessary revolving funds. If we cannot reach an agreement, the value of gold will be re-established by itself as a result of a catastrophe. There will be an unplanned devaluation, which could be a tragic repetition of the thirties.

Rueff: I agree with Mr. Triffin when he say that doubling the price of gold could create a risk of inflation. This is why I insist we should at the same time repay both the dollar and the sterling balances. Even more, since we know that Great Britain is in a difficult position I propose that the countries which have gold stocks and no dollar and sterling balances to repay offer a twenty-year loan to Great Britain in order to repay the rest of the sterling balances.

Triffin: I myself have elaborated a precise plan to this effect. I believe, as much as Mr. Rueff does, that there is absolutely no need to plan for an increase of the total volume of the world's monetary reserves for another two or three years. But I think that we do not need to raise the price of gold.

AGREEMENT URGED

That is why I suggest an immediate agreement between the eight richest countries of the world, that is the U.S.A., Great Britain, Switzerland and the Common Market five—Belgium and Luxembourg, France, Germany, Italy and the Netherlands. These countries would have not to retain more than 15% of their central-banks reserves in national currencies. The rest should be in gold. They would have not to provoke an international crisis by drawing too much gold in exchange of their sterling or dollars. And they would have to create an international organization within the I.M.F. or the I.B.R.

The organization would be a gold and currencies depot. Countries like Germany or Italy, the only ones who have considerable dollar surpluses, would be able to exchange these dollars against gold—a gold guarantee should be attached to these dollars—through the organization. The U.S.A. would have to supply the organization with no more than $1.5 billion in gold to make the exchange possible. The consequence of this would be a complete elimination of dollars and sterling from central bank reserves.

Rueff: This is a very logical and sound project. Nevertheless, I believe it has no chance whatsoever of being accepted because of the discrimination it establishes between the eight countries and the others. As for the gold guarantee for dollars and sterling, it looks like a dangerous precedent; it would make it more difficult if not impossible in the future to free ourselves of the past.

Triffin: I know that these problems exist. In fact the other countries which owe money to the states will not try to convert their gold because it is a tradition with them.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Remarks of Hon. John E. Fogarty, U.S. Representative, Second Congressional District of Rhode Island, at the Graduation Exercises of St. Mary's Academy, Bayview, June 10, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT THE GRADUATION EXERCISES OF ST. MARY'S ACADEMY, BAYVIEW, JUNE 10, 1966

I was not only honored but also sincerely grateful to Sister Marie Andre when I was asked to speak on this very happy occasion. It is an event to which all of us who are here have been looking forward, for this is a moment filled with the memories of growth and achievement as well as with great hopes and expectations for the future. And it is also a moment that provides us who have watched and shared in the growing up of the young ladies of the graduating class to express our thanks and appreciation to the good Sisters of Mercy.

I am sure that I speak not only for the parents and friends of the graduates, but for all of the people of Rhode Island when I say that the Sisters of Mercy make a contribution to the educational life of our State which can never be measured. For almost a century and a half, they have held a place of service to our youth which is unsurpassed, and their presence among us has been a blessing for generations.

Consequently, as we all join in congratulating the very lovely young ladies of the graduating class upon the completion of their high school years, I am sure that all of their happiness is shared by the Sisters, who together with parents and friends, have looked forward to this happy event. The graduates know, perhaps better than anyone, that their teachers at Bayview will always follow their progress through life with the same devoted personal interest which has marked their concern for their students during the past four years of school.

A graduation is not a time for long speeches. It is a time when the happy focus of attention should fall upon those who are graduating. And for the moment, I would like to address them and to speak of one or two things that seem to me to have an important bearing upon the future in which they will be called upon to make use of what they have learned at Bayview.

Now one of the things which must be very clear to every member of the graduating class is the simple fact that the world is changing at a rate that is unprecedented in all of history. It is hard for a person living in 1966 to imagine what the world was like in 1866, or even 1926. The musket used in the Civil War was not very different from the weapon that won the battle of Waterloo. And the Civil War musket was not really much of an improvement over the hand firearms of the fifteenth century. A sailor of Roman times, who might have sailed on a ship that took St. Paul on his missionary journeys, would not have found it difficult to work on board many of the sailing ships that still dominated the seas less than a hundred years ago.

There is no parallel in history to compare with what has resulted from the invention of the steam engine, the modern smelting of metals, the telegraph, the introduction of electric power, the airplane, the electric valve and the release of atomic energy. Travel in space, once the subject of fiction, is a fact of our times. Plagues and diseases which wiped out whole populations in the past are seldom heard of in the present.

In my own years in Congress, it has been my good fortune to share in bringing government aid to medical research and if I had the time to tell you of the advances that have been made in the last few years, I am sure that you would see that the expression "the miracle of modern medicine" is no exaggeration. Even as I am speaking to you, the men of medical research are making great new breakthroughs in the fight against such scourges as cancer and heart disease.

Change is indeed the keynote of our times. Nations that lived for centuries in the backwash of history are today emerging as powers in the world. Asia, which once seemed so remote, is now very much a part of our daily lives. Civil rights, so long denied to many Americans, are today written firmly into the law of the land.

In the Church, too, there is moving the spirit symbolized by good Pope John and the Vatican Council. And today we see the sisters and the lay people taking roles of responsibility which were almost unheard of a generation ago.

Here at Bayview the students of the graduating class—all of you who are receiving your diplomas—you have been well prepared to live and work and grow in a world of change. You are well prepared for such a world, not only because you have been taught the things which will help you to understand the changes but also because you have been taught to understand that there are some things which will never change. You have learned of the eternal truths of faith and of the enduring principles of right living that are as true today as they were when God gave the Ten Commandments to Moses and the people of Israel in the desert.

I would, therefore, believe that no word of advice to the graduates could have more importance than this: Live happily and courageously with changing times and keep faith with the changeless truth that is in you.

That, I am sure, is the spirit of Catholic education today. And some of its leading exponents are religious sisters who, as teachers and administrators, are among the foremost pioneers in American education.

Because of the special role which they have as the bearers and guardians of growing human life, women have a unique role to play in the modern world. In an age of computers and machines of many kinds, women have a special sense of the importance of the personal, human values. And it is this sense of the personal that must be preserved and respected if we are not to become the victims of our own technical progress. Charity, regard for the individual, creativity, and the opportunity for each person to develop his own abilities—these are all things which must never be brushed aside as unimportant or insignificant. On the contrary, they are vital to human survival. And only those who hold fast to the eternal values of faith and morality can be the kind of women who will know how to preserve and promote these humane qualities.

In concluding my remarks to you today, I would like to say one final word about the progress which has been made in bringing equality of educational opportunity to all of our people. The series of legislative acts relating to education which have been passed since the National Defense Education Act have made the Federal government a real partner in American education at every level. And I believe that we have made real progress in doing this in such a way that aid has been made available not only to the public, but also to the private sectors of education.

This is a matter of the greatest importance, for it is privately supported schools, colleges, and universities which are the guarantee that our educational system will always have that variety which reflects our free society and is the major bulwark against the domination of education by the government.

I am, however, by no means satisfied that we are yet doing all we can to assure true freedom and equality for parents and students who choose to attend privately supported institutions.

There is, in my opinion, much to be said for the suggestion made by Dr. John D. Millett, the chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents. Dr. Millet has recommended that the state should give tuition grants to college students whose parents have effective incomes of less than $10,000. Certainly such a plan should be seriously considered, for it would serve to strengthen the role of those independent institutions upon which so much of the variety and freedom of American education depends.

On thing is perfectly clear: Education for every American to the fullest degree of his or her potentiality ought to be recognized a part of the American birthright. And we cannot achieve this goal and preserve the freedom and rich variety of our schools if we do not consistently make aid to the student a guiding principle of policy.

The members of this graduating class are taking their places in the long procession of young women who have gone out from Bayview—and hundreds of other fine schools like it—to make their contribution as Catholic women to the progress and infinite variety of life of a free America. Let us, therefore, not only thank God and His dedicated teachers for the work which they have done. Let us also firmly resolve that this good work of education for God and country will continue to grow and flourish in the years to come.

There has always been a need for the ideals of Christian womanhood to be exemplified in our nation. That need, and the opportunities for service that go with it, is ever more urgent in the rapidly changing world of the latter part of the twentieth century. As we share in the joy of this commencement day and in the happiness of the graduates, I am sure that in them we can see the symbols of a future that is bright with promise. And I know that all here will join me when I say that the future which belongs to them will be better because of the contributions which they will make to it.

Veterans' Pension Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BILLIE S. FARNUM
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I presented to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs under date of July 19, 1966, relative to a bill I introduced, H.R. 11886, which proposes to amend Public Law 664 of the 88th Congress:

VETERANS' PENSION AMENDMENTS

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the committee for allowing me to make a brief statement concerning a bill I have introduced, H.R. 11886, to amend the laws relating to pensions for veterans and their survivors.

A number of amendments to liberalize and improve the pension laws were enacted in 1964 under Public Law 88–664. Other deficiencies and injustices in these laws, however, remain in need of correction. The bill I am proposing would make several important corrections in this area of veterans' legislation, particularly with respect to the types of income that are included in applying the income limitations of the pension laws.

The bill provides, first, that the retirement income of a pensioner shall be excluded in computing his income for the purposes of the income limitations of the pension laws. This means that income received from social security, civil service retirement or a private pension plan could not, as it now may, be used to reduce the amount of veterans' pension or to completely disqualify him from receiving a pension.

The enactment of this provision would eliminate the possibility of another anomalous situation from arising such as arose last year when the enactment of a cash benefit increase by the Social Security Amendments of 1965 resulted in some 27,000 veterns and veterans' widows having their V.A. pensions reduced or cancelled.

Under existing law, 10 percent of a pensioner's retirement income is disregarded in determining his pension. This makes very little sense and adds complexity to the law. I believe that a total exclusion of such income should be enacted.

I am aware that the Senate has passed H.R. 14347 with committee amendment to eliminate the 1965 Social Security increase and future increases as a determining factor in the amount of pension a veteran may receive. But does this take care of the situation when private, railroad retirement, or civil service retirement pensions increase their benefits? The enactment of my bill excluding retirement altogether would eliminate the possibility of such a similar situation from recurring.

The second amendment contained in the bill is intended to add simplicity and uniformity to provisions of the pension laws that are now overly complex and discriminatory. This amendment would allow the entire income of a veteran's spouse to be disregarded in determining his income. Under existing law there are two pension programs in operation. One of these is for those who were on the pension rolls prior to July 1, 1960. The other pension system, established by Public Law 86–211, is for those whose pensions were initiated since that date. Pensioners under the old pension system may elect, if they so wish, to come under the new system. The rules that apply with regard to the income of a spouse are different under the two systems. All of such income is disregarded for those under the old system, while under the new system the law provides for the exclusion of all of the spouse's *earned* income, or $1200 of her *other* income, whichever is the greater. This change in the bill would merely apply the same rule—the one that now applies to those under the old system—to all pensioners. This is not a great change in terms of dollars and cents, but it would improve the law by ridding it of its present confusing provisions.

The third section of the bill would similarly provide uniform treatment for those under the two pension systems. It would eliminate the "net worth" test which applies to pensioners under the new system but not to those under the older system. This test allows the V.A. to consider the total assets of a pensioner, not merely his income, in determining his eligibility for, or the amount of, his pension. The present "net worth" test should be abolished because it tends to penalize veterans who have had the foresight and initiative to provide some savings or a home for themselves and favors those who have not.

The last section of the bill eliminates a provision of the law that requires a veteran's pension to be reduced while he is a patient in a V.A. hospital. This is another provision that applies only to those under the new pension system. As with the two changes preceding it, this amendment would merely apply the same rule that now applies under the old pension system to all pensioners.

Mr. Chairman, the veterans' pension rolls are made up predominantly of aged veterans and their widows. Monthly pension payments are small in relation to today's living costs, ranging from $43 to $100 a month for a veteran with no dependents and from $27 to $64 a month for a veteran's widow. These payments are circumscribed by stringent income limitations. The bill I am offering would grant a moderate amount of relief to those in need of pension assistance. I do not think it is too much to ask for them.

Hats Off to the Champ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the great joys in connection with my service as a Member of the 89th Congress has been the opportunity afforded me to develop a friendship with one of New York's greats. It has been my observation that men of the Empire State go to extraordinary extremes to lead the way in many fields. That great State has produced the John Pierpont Morgans in the field of finance, the Franklin Roosevelts in the field of government, the Babe Ruths and Lou Gehrigs in the field of sports, and HUGH CAREY in the field of paternity.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but admire our colleague's excellence in the field of paternity and to reflect with awe when I learned today of the fact that he had become the father of his 14th child—9 boys, 5 girls—a magnificent record indeed.

In the field of paternity here in the House and perhaps someday in the Nation, he is truly our leader, and we are proud of his accomplishments.

I am sure all of us in the House join in extending warm congratulations to our gifted and most able colleague and his lovely and most capable wife on this happy occasion.

The Bigger Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, we read and hear every day of progress in the ground and air fighting in Vietnam, but too infrequently do we have a chance to follow the progress that has been made behind the battlefront.

President Johnson has enumerated a number of gains in the field of agriculture, education, and health. The Dallas Morning News recounts them in an editorial which also quotes these remarks by the President:

> We are now attacking with all of our strength the basic problems of illiteracy, poverty, disease. It is these problems that bring on the wars. We must continue to press this battle forward.

It is vital to wage war for the advancement of the entire population, the News asserts. And it says our recognition of this need and the fact we are doing something about it are among our major strengths—not only in Vietnam but in the underdeveloped nations.

I include this editorial in full in the RECORD:

THE BIGGER BATTLE

President Johnson's press conference at the LBJ Ranch revealed encouraging aspects of the war in Viet Nam. One of the most significant was the progress behind the battlefront in helping the Vietnamese. Mr. Johnson listed these gains:

Addition of 600,000 acres of irrigated land for food production.

Sale of land to small farmers on easy terms.

Improved education, including vocational training for 10,000 Vietnamese.

Establishment of 13,000 health stations, stocked with U.S. medicine.

"We have not waited for fighting to end before we have the beginnings of the works of peace," the President commented. "We are now attacking with all of our strength the basic problems of illiteracy, poverty, disease. It is these problems that bring on the wars. We must continue to press this battle forward."

It has been by promising, and pretending to help the peasant—and sometimes even by actually relieving his distress—that communism has made many of its gains. Often the Red oppressor has been disguised as the good servant while the free world has been pictured as the enemy of progress and improvement.

Emphasis on helping the people of Viet Nam is one of the wisest policies we could pursue. Military victory, of course, must be the primary objective, but in the long run an even greater battle must be waged for the advancement of the entire population.

Our recognition of this and the fact that we are doing something about it are among our major strengths. This is true not only in Viet Nam, but wherever U.S. knowhow and resources are being used efficiently to improve the conditions of underdeveloped nations.

Youth in America Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the youth of today hold the key to the America of tomorrow. These young people comprising almost 50 percent of the population in the United States, are a dynamic, influential force in every sector of our economy and every region of our Nation.

Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, in his article for the North American Newspaper Alliance column summarizes the challenges, the frustrations, and the hopes of the American youth. Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Nixon's remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NORTH AMERICAN NEWSPAPER ALLIANCE COLUMN

(By Richard M. Nixon)

The most startling and saddening failure of the Johnson Administration is the way it has totally lost touch with the nation's youth. The importance of this breakdown in communications becomes clear when you consider that close to half the people in America are under 25.

Item: College campus demonstrations by students, as well as street riots often led and manned by youngsters, have reached an all-time high and are getting worse;

Item: Bitter resentment against the unfairness of the draft system, which favors the wealthy and the gifted, is boiling up among millions of draft-age Americans;

Item: Unemployment among young workers is running at a rate close to twice the national average while unemployment for high-school dropouts and youngsters in minority groups is even worse.

What underlies the draft-card burnings, the troop-train blockings, the lure of LSD, the rebellion against authority at some of our greatest universities?

The answer is loss of contact, and here are some of the reasons for it:

The torch that was supposed to have been passed to a new generation appears to have been passed right back, and the youngest generation resents it. In the Johnson Administration, the problems of youth just have to wait until they become the problems of the aging.

Youth today sees no idealism in our national purpose. Where they seek commitment to a cause, they find only compromise to a consensus. The shining promises of the Kennedy Administration—which had enormous appeal to young people throughout the country—have been replaced by the Johnson Administration's image of shrewd politics at home and confused goals abroad.

This generation of Americans feels that it has no "rendezvous with destiny," in FDR's phrase, which explains the shift away from Johnson and the attraction of ROBERT KENNEDY, not so much for what he does or says, but for the idealism he seems to symbolize.

The trouble is that the government does not know "what's happening" in the young people's sense of the term.

"What's happening" is this: Never before has a "younger generation" been so educated, articulate, aware of big issues.

Never before has a younger generation been so closely attuned to a social revolution, pressing its elders in the cause of equal rights. There is a world of difference between the campus horseplay of the past and the demonstrations of today.

Never before has a generation of under-25 Americans felt itself so estranged from the rest of our society, so alienated and isolated. This generation is neither "lost" nor "beat;" it is lonely, partly due to the natural rebelliousness of youth against any established authority, but due largely to an outdated paternalism on the part of our national leaders.

Young people today do not appreciate a pat on the head and a smiling "someday you'll understand" from their parents or their government. While the beatniks and the demonstrators receive all the attention, the vast majority of American youth is responsible and thoughtful; they deserve a voice in the decisions that affect them because big government affects every American's life much more now than in any previous generation.

To re-establish contact with the millions of worried, rootless, exuberant young people—many of whom will be the future leaders of our nation—the Administration should take these immediate steps:

1. Convene a White House Conference on Youth, to focus national attention on the problems and opportunities facing our young men and women. In the past few years we have had White House Conferences on subjects ranging from Export Expansion to Health to Natural Beauty. Certainly a major effort is called for on something as important as the re-involvement of the young people of our country.

2. Appoint a representative group of young people to be a permanent Advisory Council on Youth, giving both students and post-high school working youngsters a genuine voice in the making of policies that affect all young people.

3. Reject the defeatist, life-is-unfair approach to military service and adopt a uniform way of putting men in uniform.

Handled in a superficial, publicity-stunt way, the White House Conference and the Advisory Council would surely be a waste of time and money; but handled with understanding and a willingness to learn, a clear channel of communication could be opened between the government and the most vital single segment of our population.

The Communist world has used youth conferences as a means of propaganda and indoctrination; we could expand our own youth conference to a world gathering of young leaders with the purpose of commitment and self-expression.

In this way, representatives of all segments of America's youth could become involved in those decisions that affect them. We talk about bringing the poor into the poverty program—why not bring the youth into the decisions about youth programs? Only if they participate, can we expect them to become committed to constructive causes.

In that context—with genuine contact made—an older generation will have the chance to express its own resentments about a decline in moral values, a rejection of responsibility by many young people. But for a change, an older generation will not be muttering to itself or shouting to deaf ears—a two-way street will have been created that permits some sort of dialogue. To a new generation that considers itself "turned on," the older generation can hardly afford to turn itself off.

In that context, many of our young people will be willing to be exposed to solid direction and face hard questions like these: How can a rule of law be established by breaking laws that you do not like? How can your rights be protected if you are unwilling to respect the rights of others? Where does responsible protest end and irresponsible rebelliousness begin?

If the government will only undertake an all-out effort to communicate with its younger citizens, if government shows an inclination to listen more than to lecture, youth will be served—and the nation will be served as well.

Food for Thought: OEO and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, Montana and other States have been granted funds by the Office of Economic Opportunity to provide legal services. This program as outlined by the Montana Bar Association, is a new and radical concept of supplying legal services.

Mr. Charles F. Moses, a Billings, Mont., lawyer, has made a thorough and searching analysis of this program and I have permission that his appraisal, comments, and conclusions be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BILLINGS, MONT.,
June 30, 1966.

In attending the recent Montana Bar Association meeting, the purposes and functions of O.E.O. were casually discussed. Everything appeared to be cut and dried and the program for federal intervention in the law business seemed launched to a bright future amid the seeming approbation of the leaders of the Bar. Two thoughts carried the day. First, if the Bar does not do something, then the Government will, and the Bar must proceed, oneupsmanship, to provide federal services for the poor. Secondly, there is a dramatic need to aid the poverty-stricken people of Montana. And so it goes—"participate or perish" and "provide for the poor"—and if you do, the Federal Government will give you bushels of money to provide legal services for the poverty-stricken in Montana.

It sounds like a fair deal, but let us analyze it.

Accept the fact there are many people who are unable to afford to hire an attorney when he or she needs one. Accept the further fact that the necessity for a lawyer in any case is inherent in our judicial system. This is borne out by the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Accept the fact that the Bar Association should participate and fill this need. Accept the furthere fact the Government will pay to satisfy this need. All arguments are therefore resolved and accepted without question that a program to help the needy is required in Montana to be fronted by the Bar.

There may not be a scintilla of evidence, or proof or measurable fact to sustain the lofty conclusions supported by the Bar. It would be interesting, indeed, to have such a presentation made before a judge and the question of whether the burden of proof was sustained would be an interesting one if left to the courts—but we shall not argue or suggest that they are not fully sustained by the evidence—this may be too lawyer-like for a federal program. Therefore, we accept fully the premise, "Participate for the Poor".

COMMENTS

But these are not really the points in issue. The need, duly established, the participation, duly polled, are indeed irrelevant to the discussion. What then, in fact, are the basic issues to be discussed about the program before we dip our fingers into the government till?

First. What is the role, scope and purpose of the Federal Government in this program? Can we help carry out these goals?

Second. How can we provide effective and competent legal services to the disadvantaged? *What have they a right to expect?*

Third. What can the individual lawyer do to aid the poor? What should be our position on this program?

Fourth. How does this program fit into our judicial system?

These issues appear to me to be of vital concern to all practicing lawyers and bear analysis, discussion and eventual decision.

Let us briefly consider my point of view on this problem. It is not important that you agree or disagree, but it does seem important to consider the issues as they are presented. If there is no consideration of these issues, then a complete judgment by default is apparent and as we make our bed surely we will lie in it.

1. The interest of the Government

It is not trite to suggest that the interest of the Government is two-fold—one, to provide legal services for the poor, and, two, to provide the money to pay for these services. This philosophy is fine and should meet with our general approval, but when coupled with control, direction, and a new branch of government to aid the poor as an "overlay" upon our present judicial system, it must require more than casual study. Again, it seems to me that two matters merit thought and consideration by members of the Bar.

(a) This program as outlined by the Montana Bar Association is a new and radical concept of supplying legal services. The administration of justice is not now a judicial matter where attorneys are "officers of the Court", some are now officers of O.E.O. and controlled by the Poverty Board which is controlled, in turn, by the Federal Government. We are not so naive to say that this isn't so, and if it is not so now it surely will be in the future. The question that is properly raised is why the departure? Is not our judicial system able to fill the need within its own framework? Cannot lawyers be controlled by the Court? Why this administrative federal executive approach? Has a study been made to demonstrate our judicial system just cannot handle the problem? If this program has such merit, why not have federal lawyers to handle criminal cases as well? Why not blanket our system with a comprehensive federal program?

Why not, indeed!

(b) Consider the possibilities where the federal lawyer represents the indigent plaintiff and the federal lawyer represents the indigent defendant and the federal lawyer represents the indigent intervenor and the federal lawyer who represents the indigent witness in the same case who must be protected against the right of self-incrimination. And finally, the same federal lawyer who represents the wife of the indigent plaintiff, the ex-wife of the indigent defendant and the abandoned children of the indigent intervenor. Surely federal attorneys will fight federal attorneys and, like Topsy, it will grow and grow until we can charter a federal Bar.

2. The poverty people

But what does the poor person have a right to expect? It seems that we speak of him as a class apart, as someone we will assign a lawyer to handle so he will not bother us, use our time or expand our energy with cases below our talents. On the other hand, it seems to me that he should have a right to expect competent services, fair choice, and ultimately a lawyer of his own choosing. In one casual moment, we seemingly strip a person of his right to "choose" his lawyer. What is bad about letting a poor person have the choice, like everyone else? Why is she or he different? Is this the price of being poor—and the cost of securing such services? Can he or she change lawyers if they like? It seems the only conclusion by O.E.O. is that poor people can be classified, organized and given a specific attorney who will be paid for by the Government and they had damn well better be grateful.

It is my impression that the poor people are, after all, people. They are not different and need not be organized, classified or specified. All they want is a lawyer of their choice, and they should be entitled to exercise this right of choice. It may be that the Government feels they are not capable of making the choice and that we can do this small chore for them, but I feel we should let them try.

3. The lawyer

Let me recite my views in clear and unmistakable terms.

(a) The lawyer stands to lose his lawyer-client relationship. There will not be a "choice" by a person who wants you to perform legal services. Clients will not be yours to represent over the years. In this respect, I am not concerned about the established firms—they could care less, because it does not affect them. They have even had the temerity to suggest it would relieve the lawyer of some of his "nasty" business.

(b) The role of the lawyer, as I see it, is to represent all of the people in the state of Montana, including the poor. This is his responsibility. He cannot create a program transferring this problem to a federal attorney who will be paid to "handle" the problem and then say he is "participating". All of us must be involved with the poor and it is totally indefensible to shirk responsibility by creating a program where you say, "Don't knock on any door particularly my door." We have a government attorney to "handle" these things—keeping, nonetheless, the "good business" of the poor by careful classification.

Has it occurred to anyone or has it even been suggested that we handle the Negroes in the same way? We could suggest that he is not our problem, and we could create a program where the government aids the Negro and that ought to be enough responsibility and certainly would satisfy our participation in such program. It does not seem to me to be logical or citizenlike.

In sum, the lawyer is disclaiming responsibility for the poor not accepting or advocating it. The individual lawyer who so abdicates his responsibility is not now an independent, thoughtful, participating member of his community. He isolates the poor, he doesn't face up to the problem in supplying his talents to the poor.

4. Judicial system

It seems to me that we organize attorneys as officers of the Court. We represent indigent defendants in state and federal courts. We are subject to elaborate disciplinary procedures. Our licenses are a privilege soon taken for transgression. We are subject to being held liable for contempt of Court. Yet, on the other hand, we like to think we uphold the interest, integrity and honor of our judicial system.

Instead of using this system to expand aid to the poor, we now have a new federal program. Is it impossible for us not to work within our system our framework as we know it? As Bob Emmons said at the Bar meeting, if attachments, landlord-tenant, and related problems, cry for assistance to the poor, why not legislate? Is the Bar unable to grip the problem other than by a vast overlay of government legal intervention controlled outside of our traditional judicial system? These questions require some response.

CONCLUSION

All in all, I find the proposed program at variance with our traditional sense of justice, our judicial system as a whole, and our legal relationship with our clients, past, present and future. It is a radical, controlled innovation that will, in my opinion, alter the independence of lawyers and our entire judicial system.

It need not be so!

Let us serve the poor. I propose that we use the Government's money. Let each person have the lawyer of his own choosing. Let the disadvantaged pay if they can—and if they can't, judicial approval of claims should satisfy our friendly Federal Government. In cases where no lawyer will take the case, the Bar may decide who has the task, but the Bar should be advisory only. It is my view that we should fit this program into our judicial system and that lawyers should be responsible to the Courts and not to the Federal Government. It appears that if there is a need for legislation the Bar should take an affirmative step in solving the problems that confront the poor by legislation. We should face up to the specific problems of the poor. I think we should participate. I think we should reflect upon the lawyer-client relationship and satisfy ourselves as to how to provide the best services to the poor, and it is clear that the obvious answer to that question is to provide "your services if you care."

The Bar Association should be criticized for its failure to personally participate in helping the poor. The Federal Program as the answer merely neatly sidesteps involvement. Obviously, "We don't care enough to give our very best."

Formal approval of $216,000 for the Program by members of the Association has not been done. Can we say this represents the desires of the majority of the lawyers in the state?

Since there has not been a formal vote of the lawyers of this state with respect to this program, I respectfully submit that each lawyer should examine the issues and formally vote "No" to the program as outlined by sending your comments to the President of the Montana Bar Association. You have an opportunity to make an appearance in this matter, and I do not feel that the cause must be lost by default.

Let me review the situation:

1. The need for legal services for the poor is used as the basis for a federal program creating federal responsibility and federal control. There is but passing concern for improving legal assistance to the poor within the framework of our judicial system. In my view, this approach is bad. The solution is not a new federal program, it is increased responsibilities of lawyers and courts to solve the problems of the poor. Greater participation, not federal intervention is the true answer.

2. The concept of our judicial system as a branch of our government handling legal affairs is abandoned. The executive branch now, and in the future, will control a segment of our judicial system. We must assume, if we accept such program, that our system is incapable of solving the needs, and I do not believe this to be so.

3. The segregation of poor people by creation of federal attorneys to handle their problems is contrary to every concept of O.E.O. as stated by Sargent Shriver. He seeks to place these people in the mainstream of life without the burden of their financial status. Their respect, their integrity, their

promise for the future is dependent upon individual lawyer's responsibility. We must integrate the poor, not separate them. The outlined program of the Bar is not in accord with these basic concepts.

4. The future will, in my opinion, see at least one federal attorney for each private one. The wage rate, the secretarial services, the investigative help, and the entire overhead will make the private practice of law intolerable because we cannot financially meet the competition. It would literally be competing with the Federal Government.

5. Limiting or classifying, for the present, good business of the poor for the private attorney is but a temporary classification. Even now on some Indian reservations in the nation service is provided federally in any case without limitation. This not only is the trend, but the poor people will demand it, since it is only logical that they will soon want every case handled by the federal attorney.

6. Can we spend great sums of money for federal aid and control when we think less money provided to an integrated system will do the job better for less, with each lawyer contributing to the poor?

7. Should a lawyer participate or should a lawyer transfer his responsibility to the Federal Government?

Finally, these comments are subject to the valid criticism that they are emotional in character and come too late. In my judgment, it is never too late to think and care, and I respectfully submit this matter for your consideration.

CHARLES F. MOSES.

The Airline Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, the current strike of machinists against five airlines is costly—costly to the companies, costly to the men on strike and their families, costly to other airline employees and, most of all, costly to many businesses and the traveling public.

We, the people, are paying too high a price to protect somebody else's privileges. I do not know who is the privileged one in this instance, the companies or the union. Inasmuch as the union has been unwilling to accept the terms proposed by the Emergency Board, however, it seems to me it must bear most of the blame for this strike. At least, the burden of proof falls to the union.

Every strike involving a public utility means that collective bargaining has failed as a method of settling labor disputes, and reemphasizes that, some day, the people are likely to do away with the bargaining process and the strike. They will be replaced by compulsory arbitration in some form.

I do not think that will be good for either side; but it might be better for the people—who want labor peace—and the economy—which wants production.

I urge that both sides in this dispute go to the bargaining table with this larger issue in mind.

A New Century—A New Challenge—*Address by Vice President Humphrey* Before Tennessee Education Association in Memphis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, this spring some 9,000 members of the Tennessee Education Association gathered in Memphis for their annual meeting.

The highlight of the 3-day event was an address by Vice President HUMPHREY, who completely captivated the city during his brief visit. It was my great privilege to introduce him to members of the Tennessee Education Association.

I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the text of the Vice President's magnificent address:

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY TO THE TENNESSEE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, MEMPHIS, TENN., APRIL 1, 1966

Thank you Congressman GRIDER for your gracious and eloquent introduction. I thank you especially because you didn't let yourself be confined by Washington protocol and just say: "The Vice President." You took a little time to talk me up, and I want you to know that I appreciate it.

I shall address my remarks today to this year's theme for your organization: "A New Century—A New Challenge." It has a special meaning for you as an organization, because last year you celebrated your own centenary. But it has a wider significance, for the entire South and for the nation. For it marks the beginning of a new century—the second century—since the end of the War Between the States.

It is a time to close the books once and for all on the past, and to look bravely and hopefully to the future. You yourselves took an important step forward last year, when you opened your membership to teachers of all races. I am sure you will be even more effective in reaching your goals when all your forces are united in the cause of better education for all of Tennessee's children.

For, as Thomas Jefferson wrote soon after the founding of our Republic, our task must be to "educate and inform the whole mass of the people" . . . to "enable them to see that it is to their interest to preserve peace and order . . . they are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty."

This new century holds great promise for Southern education and the people of the South. I say this for two reasons.

First, because of the far-reaching legislation enacted last year, with the invaluable help of Congressman GRIDER and the other members of the Tennessee Congressional delegation. This legislation puts us at the threshold of a new era for *all* American education.

And second, the South itself is clearly in the opening of a new cycle of economic growth—a new renaissance. This forward thrust will in large part be fostered and sustained by its educational resources.

The American people have always pinned their hopes for the future—the future of the nation and the future of their own children—on education. This has been particularly true in the South. But, while the desire for good education in the South has always been strong, harsh economic realities have limited educational opportunity. But times are changing, and changing for the better. The South is moving out of its old agricultural economy and into an industrial era. The gap between the South and the rest of the nation is closing. The economic gap is closing. We must also close the educational gap.

If I seem all wrapped up in this subject, it is because I am still a teacher at heart. More importantly, this is an "Education Administration" that I am privileged to represent. There are a great many teachers in the Executive Branch and in the Congress. President Johnson is a former teacher, and proud of it. Senator MANSFIELD, the Majority Leader, was a professor of history at the University of Montana. Congressman CARL ALBERT, the Majority Leader of the House, was a Rhodes Scholar. You can go through the top echelons of our government and find teachers in place after place.

This Administration, I want you to know, will not rest until every American child, wherever he may live, whatever his race, religion, or national origin, has all the education he can usefully absorb. The legislation which Congress enacted last year will result in profound changes not only in education, but in our whole future social and economic life. The new programs are going to give fresh impetus to people and communities hitherto left behind the rest of our nation.

Under these new circumstances, you as professional educators will occupy key roles in your communities. The financial headaches of your schools are not over—in the nature of things, they never will be—but for the first time many of you will be able to "think big."

You will find that, in the councils of government, the educator will no longer be sitting below the salt. Instead, he will be moving a lot closer to the head of the table. In the state house, educators will no longer risk being regarded merely as supplicants. Tomorrow, the educator will be seen as a man who brings wealth into his community—and not just federal aid to education. For quality education attracts and holds business and industry, creating new payrolls and new resources. Indeed, a recent survey of 500 of our leading corporations showed that they base their decisions on the location of new plants first of all upon the educational facilities of a community and its commitment to their further extension.

I congratulate you on your new—and abundantly deserved—status in our society. If I can offer one word of advice, it is this: Let no feelings of false modesty induce you not to press your advantage to the utmost.

This new generation needs—and deserves—the best education we can give them. They are fine young people, with a great potential. Just as Tennessee is the Volunteer State, this is the volunteer generation. Whether serving in uniform or in shirt-sleeves, at home or overseas, they are giving generously and willingly of their best.

A nation that can produce the kind of young men and women who serve this nation in our armed forces, the Peace Corps, our government missions overseas, in the CARE program, and in the relief services of our great religious denominations—a society with this degree of voluntarism is a society that has something to commend itself to history. Never at any time has a nation given so much in the cause of peace and humanity, and expected so little in return, as the United States.

In the years immediately ahead, our young people will be confronted with new challenges which will call upon ever ounce of their energy, intelligence and dedication.

They will have the task, first and foremost, of building an enduring peace—a peace which will have to be built by a hundred thousand individual, positive acts. For peace will not be built by any grand gesture or magical formula. It will be built in the hot streets and muddy fields of countries which did not even exist 20 years ago. It will be built in long months of tireless, patient negotiation over the most minor of international issues. It will be built by people possessing adequate knowledge of their world and its complexities.

Our young generation will have the responsibility, too, of making technological progress the servant rather than the master of humanity.

They will have the privilege of waging the war against poverty which President Johnson has launched—an undertaking without precedent in the history of the world.

But there is one piece of unfinished business we must not and cannot leave to them, because it is far too urgent. We must make good, in fact as well as in law, without delay or equivocation, the pledge of our Constitution that all Americans, everywhere, shall have equal opportunity to enjoy the blessings of our Republic.

The greatest single contribution we can make to the future of America is to see to it that each individual is given every opportunity to make the most out of his life. We bear heavy responsibilities in this world, and the denial to anyone of the right to participate in shouldering them weakens this country. A century ago Abraham Lincoln called America "the last, best hope on earth"—and it still is.

Congress has recognized its responsibilities to our new generation in the historic school legislation it adopted last year. Members of Congress from the South—and particularly Senator Bass, Senator Gore, Congressman Grider and other Tennessee Congressmen—worked hard to achieve this.

Under the formulas adopted, the Southern states will, as a group, gain the most. We expect the programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to bring 1.2 billion dollars to education throughout the country during the first year of its operation, and 1.3 billion in its second. Roughly a half-billion of this will be channeled each year into the elementary and secondary schools of the South. They will receive more than their proportionate income tax contributions.

This is as it should be. All the same, I think we should pay tribute here to the many legislators from high-income states who have consistently, over the last 25 years, worked to enact programs which would cost their taxpayers more than they bring into their own states.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act will help approximately seven million educationally deprived children from low-income families.

Now for a few words about what the Act means to Tennessee. As you know, it includes several different programs.

First and most substantial in dollars, it provides aid to low-income districts—that is, districts with a substantial number of families with incomes of less than two thousand dollars. Our estimate is that this can mean over 32 million dollars for Tennessee. The indications are that some 300,000 children in this state will benefit from this part of the Act in the current fiscal year.

Next, the Act provides funds for school libraries and textbooks. Our estimate for this is over 1.8 million dollars for Tennessee.

Further, it includes grants for supplementary educational centers and services, estimated for Tennessee at almost 1.5 million dollars.

Also, it offers grants to strengthen state departments of education—estimated at almost 300,000 dollars for Tennessee.

Another provision of the Act authorizes the Office of Education to step up the improvement of education through research and development activities. Experts from all parts of the country have been involved in the planning of the National Program of Educational Laboratories, the largest single effort under this authority. Developmental contracts for nine such laboratories were approved and announced on March 1. Of these, two include parts of Tennessee in the areas they serve—the Appalachia and the Central Mid-Western Regional Educational Laboratories.

Here, certainly, is opportunity for creative innovation in the schools of Tennessee, as in schools throughout the nation. Here, to revert to your theme for this year, is a new challenge for a new century.

Those in our society who most need education too often have been the ones least likely to receive it. Here I can speak out of personal experience. When I was Mayor of Minneapolis, one thing that perplexed me was why the best public services were in the areas of the city that needed them the least. The newest schools were located where people had the highest incomes; the best playgrounds, where families had memberships in country clubs. Actually, the best schools, playgrounds, and other facilities ought to be in the areas that can least afford them. Otherwise, students whose home environment is drab and dulling all too often find their schools equally so.

We must make our schools lively and challenging to these youngsters. We in Washington can't tell you how to do it, and we don't intend to try. But we do hope and expect that you will come up with new and effective teaching techniques which will make the schools so interesting that there won't be any drop-outs. We can't afford them, because we need well-educated people in our modern, technologically advanced economy. Every school drop-out is a potential liability to himself and to the community.

In conclusion, I should like to direct your attention to the international implications of education.

In his message to Congress on this subject a few weeks ago, President Johnson said:

"Education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes. It must be at the heart of our international relations."

Of course, I am sure you have felt this all along. But it is new—a real landmark in the history of American education—to have it stated as national policy.

The proposed International Education Act of 1966 also embodies that high commitment.

The keystone of the new program is the establishment within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of a Center for Educational Cooperation. This will bring into being for the first time a general headquarters for coordinating our work in international education.

The President has directed that funds be earmarked to strengthen and enrich the curriculum relating to world affairs in elementary and secondary schools. There is a provision also for establishing a placement service to put our teachers in posts abroad, so as to add to their international experience.

The proposed International Education Act will help our smaller colleges so that they can better equip their graduates with knowledge of the outside world. It will also support the further strengthening of the larger universities as the nation's leading centers of advanced training and research in international affairs.

In this connection, I want to congratulate Memphis State University—many of whose graduates, I understand, are here—on its plans to establish an Institute for the Study of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. I am pleased, also, to hear that the University hopes in the future to add a number of courses on China, and make the Institute a major center for the study of Sino-Soviet affairs.

I came back from my recent trip to Asia with a clear and strong feeling—which, not being reticent by nature, I have frequently and forcefully shared—that we Americans need to know much more about the world in which we live—and particularly about Asia, with its two billion people. We are a world leader, but we have only half-world knowledge.

It took World War II to bring us to the realization that we could no longer ignore Europe. It took Vietnam—the sorrow, the pain, and the misery of that terrible struggle—to awaken us to Asia.

Education will become an increasingly important part of our aid program in Asia. Already, for example, we have helped the Government of South Vietnam more than double its classrooms, nearly triple enrollment in primary schools in its first decade of independence, and step up its enrollment in secondary schools by a factor of better than six over the same period. More and more, we see education as the keystone in the building of nations.

I like to think that mankind will come to regard the United States, not as a gendarme among nations, but as a global center of enlightenment and learning.

I want us to understand that, important as nuclear power is, the power of the mind and the spirit is more important. I want the world to know that the America of the 20th Century is not only a nation that steadfastly fulfils its commitments, it is a nation that inquires, that seeks to learn, that honors the scholar and the teacher.

The educator is already as vital to our international relations as the diplomat or soldier. I can foresee a time when he will be even more important—the time when cooperation rather than conflict is the rule in human relations and when, in the words of the prophet Isaiah, "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, nor shall they learn war any more."

Suicide and Alcoholism: Americans Look the Other Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address which I gave at the 74th annual banquet of the East Providence Chamber of Commerce, on June 11, 1966:

SUICIDE AND ALCOHOLISM: AMERICANS LOOK THE OTHER WAY

(Remarks by Representative John E. Fogarty, Second Rhode Island District, before the 74th annual banquet of the East Providence Chamber of Commerce, Metacomet Country Club, June 11, 1966)

Judge Weisberger, I'm pleased to be home again this evening, to celebrate with you at the seventy-fourth annual dinner of the East Providence Chamber of Commerce.

As toastmaster, you are presiding at a very special event, because I doubt if there are many towns and cities across the breadth of the United States whose Chambers of Commerce have an unbroken history of almost three quarters of a century of civic leadership. I hope you will invite me back next year, for your diamond jubilee.

I am especially pleased to be able to salute your guest of honor as he completes his term as President of this Chamber. Jim Reilly and I went to school together and even after all these years, we are still friends. I know that his stewardship in the past year has brought the affairs of this organization forward, and that his successor will take over the guidance of a strong and effective group.

I am going to talk about two subjects tonight that are not usually discussed at banquets and social events. But I am going to do it anyway, because the time has come when all of us, from East Providence, Rhode Island to West San Diego, California, must admit failure and—what is much more important—get some civic programs going at the National, State, city and even neighborhood levels, if we are to change the situation I want to discuss with you here.

I am talking about suicide and I am talking about alcoholism.

We have suicides in East Providence and we have alcoholics in East Providence. And we don't do very much to help the man who is finally driven to kill himself, or the person whose life is wrecked by the bottle.

The whole point is that East Providence is not alone in this neglect. In most parts of this Nation, these are facts of living that are—at worst, simply ignored and swept under the rung, or—at best, given lip service rather than effective consideration.

The thing that infuriates me is the fact that we know enough to prevent many suicides and we are beginning to collect some knowledge about controlling alcoholism. But we don't put what we know to use.

You know that I am deeply involved, in the Congress, with securing good health legislation and appropriating the money necessary to make that legislation work.

It is no platitude to say that the mental health of the people in any town and in the entire country is our greatest resource. I propose that we put the knowledge and the funds available to us to work immediately to stop this human waste.

Let's look first at suicide and suicide prevention.

The rate of suicide in the United States is ten suicides for every hundred thousand residents. That means that every 24 minutes, another person kills himself. Suicide in this country is the tenth leading cause of death.

The facts are even more shocking when you begin to find out who these people are.

In the armed forces, suicide is the second cause of death.

A current suicide study conducted at the National Institute of Mental Health indicates beyond doubt that adolescents of college age present the highest potential suicide risk group within the population. The number of adolescent suicides is low, in relation to the total population, but the risk is high.

In the 15-to-19 age group, suicide is the third-ranking cause of death, exceeded only by accident and cancer.

In the collegiate group, suicide is the second ranking cause of death, with the rate for boys twice as high as the rate for girls.

I know you agree with me that tragic as the suicide of an adult may be, it pales beside the tragedy of the child who is so lost and lonely and confused that he takes his own life.

In a study of the 41 children in the New Jersey school system who committed suicide between -1960 and 1963, we have some information that can and should be acted upon.

In going back over the lives of these youngsters, the investigators found out that suicidal children are often those who do not take part in school activities outside the classroom—the athletic teams, the orchestras, the dramatic clubs or any of the usual after-school activities most children like.

Thirty of these 41 youngsters were seriously retarded in reading, even though they had better than average intelligence ratings. But the most significant factor related to suicide among school children was that in every case of suicide in the study the child had no close friends.

In every instance, the difference between the child who threatened suicide but did not and the child who took his life was the presence, or the absence, of someone to whom that kid felt close; someone he could talk to and someone who liked him the way he was.

You know, it should not be difficult to change that situation; all that takes is time and interest in these youngsters.

The statistics go on and on; and so do the suicides. But the most tragic part of the whole sad story is that most suicides are unnecessary. We already know how to prevent many of them, if we wanted to.

Dr. Stanley Yolles, the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, tells me that within 5 years, given adequate support, we could cut the number of suicides in half. And he adds that this can be done with the knowledge we already have—to say nothing of the things we could learn as we went along.

I am happy to report to you that we are making a beginning in establishing a national suicide prevention program this year. The National Institute of Mental Health is establishing a Center for the Study of Suicide Prevention. This, as I say, is a beginning, but the success of any such center rests in the long run with the local communities.

Through this Center, the Federal Government can support research, pilot studies, training and consultation. But the actual prevention programs must be set up in East Providence and in San Francisco and in rural areas, if we are to put that Federal support to work for us.

More doctors must be told how to recognize a person's cry for help when he first indicates that he is in deep trouble.

In over half the suicide deaths, the individual who killed himself had indicated to someone that suicide was on his mind. Sometimes he did it directly, by saying "I'm going to shoot myself." Sometimes he hinted at it by, for example, asking "how do you leave your body to the medical school." But in half the cases, the suicide had asked for help in one way or another. What we need to know is how we can recognize those cries for help and how we can do something when we hear them.

The new community mental health centers which are being built and organized now, with grants from the Federal Government, can help to reduce the number of suicides. One of the services required, if a center is to receive Federal funds, is a psychiatric emergency service; and such a service is a necessity for hundreds of people in a suicidal crisis.

Very few communities today have anything like an adequate service for any kind of psychiatric emergency. If you doubt me, just try to get professional help for someone who says he's going to commit suicide in the middle of the night, or on a weekend, or—for that matter—at any time of the day in a lot of places.

This, to me, is a shocking situation: especially since we know what to do. I would suggest that this Chamber of Commerce membership take a look at the situation here; it isn't the responsibility of the doctor or the policeman or the priest alone. Simply from a dollars-and-cents point of view, it is a civic question and a civic problem. I hope that Rhode Island takes some leadership in availing itself of the help that the new Suicide Prevention Center at the NIMH is prepared to provide us. Some communities are going to leap at the opportunity and some are going to let it go by. It's a brand new national suicide prevention program and our State should participate at its beginnings.

The suicide problem is big enough, but the woe and trouble and waste of men's lives caused by the misuse of alcohol in this country is so much greater that it is almost impossible to visualize it in the national sense. I think that is one reason we have failed so dismally up to now in this area.

I am not talking about the person who likes his drinks and handles them. I'm talking about the men and women who let alcohol wreck their own lives, the lives of their families and cause trouble wherever they work.

There are at least 5 million alcoholics in this country and nothing has been done about them.

Oh, I know. There has been some research, some treatment and some effective attempts at rehabilitation, but these are extremely insignificant when you place them beside the total problem.

I have argued and pleaded and cajoled—from the floor of the House, in Committee, and at many a gathering in and outside Washington, and up until now, I'm afraid I haven't achieved much. But I am happy to tell you this evening that the National Institute of Mental Health has *finally* organized a National Center for the Prevention and Control of Alcoholism.

Now this, too, is just a beginning, and I'm sorry to say that we do not know as much about preventing alcoholism as we do about preventing suicide. But we know more, even about the control of alcoholism, than we are putting to use.

This new Center, if it does what it is supposed to do, can put the pieces of our knowledge together in a usable package so that community services can do a lot more than to throw a drunk into jail and hope that he will sleep it off and then leave town.

Research into the cause and control and treatment of alcoholism has improved in the past ten years and many more competent investigators are becoming interested in the problem. If we give them the money and the trained personnel they need, we can speed things up because the new Center can pull the knowledge together and get it out to the community where it can do some good.

I do not mean to imply that the mere establishment of such a Center will solve our problems, but at least it can exert some national leadership in developing and coordinating a scientific program.

The NIMH can put a number of experts to work on various parts of this program, to accelerate activity in everything from basic research in the biological effects of alcohol on man to the kinds of treatment and counselling that can be provided to alcoholics and members of their families in their home communities.

In the long run, it will take more money and more trained personnel to do this job, because this is only a beginning.

If the new National Center can come up with some answers—even on a trial basis—communities can test them out.

Here again, the community with a new mental health center may have the best opportunity to solve at least part of its alcohol problem.

Some of the new Centers plan to provide emergency treatment and rehabilitation services to alcoholics in the same facilities where persons with other psychiatric problems are treated. Others are planning separate services for alcoholics. However, no matter what the pattern for treatment may be, the new National Center for the Prevention and Control of Alcoholism will be able to provide support for community programs in several ways.

The Institute's Regional offices will handle local requests for help in setting up treatment and educational programs. It will take more trained people to do this job, and Federal funds available for grants to training facilities can make this possible.

I shall not go into further detail this evening on the mechanics necessary to make these two new Centers effective. But I did want to tell you about them so that East Providence and other Rhode Island communities can take advantage of the help they will have to offer.

Because we can all be sure of one thing. Suicides and alcoholics will not disappear, even if we look the other way. We have done this so long that today, no matter where we look, we see the tragic results of the uncontrolled use of alcohol, and in too many directions, we see the headlines on suicide or the man jumping off the bridge. And then we see what the fact of that unprevented suicide does to the family, the friends and the colleagues left behind.

As modern Americans—even though we, personally, may never have been affected by someone's self-inflicted death, or never have been hurt by the alcoholic tragedy of a personal friend—we know that a healthy community is made up of healthy individuals.

Health and health services are now community business and a civic concern. So, only with a personal investment on all our parts can this or any other community in the United States become a healthy place in which to live.

A 4-Year Term for Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to enclose the testimony that I presented before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, in support of my House Joint Resolution 412, a 4-year term for Congressmen. Even though my term of office expires this year, I feel that a 4-year term for Congressmen will mean better service on the part of a number of dedicated public servants, and I surely hope that my colleagues who agree with me will continue to work for this goal. My testimony follows:

A 4-YEAR TERM FOR CONGRESSMEN

(Testimony of Hon. D. R. "BILLY" MATTHEWS, before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in support of House Joint Resolution 412)

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to testify in behalf of H.J. Res. 412, a proposed constitutional amendment providing for a four year term for Members of the House of Representatives. My resolution is similar to H.J. Res. 394, by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. CHELF, which provides for half of the Members of the House of Representatives to be elected each two years, as nearly equal as possible. Half of the Members would be elected for two years and half for four years, by lot, after the first election or changes. My resolution further provides that incumbent Members of the House may not resign to seek any other elective office unless vacant when sought.

The present two year term for Representatives was instituted by the framers of the Constitution in the belief that such a term would be sufficiently long to enable Members of the House to come to grips with public issues and to give the best of themselves to the resolution of these issues, and yet sufficiently short so that they would be placed under the necessity of keeping the rights and legitimate interests of their constituents in the forefront of their thinking and acting.

The factors involved in public issues have changed so completely and have become so enormously complex and highly technical that the two year term for Members of the House has not only ceased to further the aims that the Founding Fathers had in mind but actually frustrates their attainment.

Consider, if you please, some of the public issues with which Members of the House are concerned and which were not their concern during the early days of the Republic. Today, Congress must confront the problem of unemployment caused by technological innovation. It has allocated to itself the review and evaluation of the needs of our public schools. It must seek constant resolution of the conflict between management and labor. It must determine the future of our technological effort in space. It must judge the needs of our urban centers with respect to such things as housing and mass transit. It must respond to the problems of agriculture. It must determine the role of government in experimental research in the physical sciences. It must pass laws in the area of our national security that are becoming tremendously more complex. It must evaluate the mounting problems of banking and currency. It is being urged to consider more and more legislation in the area of civil rights.

We could continue with examples of the responsibilities of Congress today, which did not confront our forebears in the early days of the Republic. I maintain that, if Congress is to continue to fulfill the duties assigned to it by the American people, each and every Representative in the House, from the freshman member to the most senior, must be enabled to acquire a comprehensive grasp of social factors and an insight into the moral obligations implicit in complex social situations, which are indispensable to the work of legislation. I maintain that a four year term for members enhances their opportunity in the House of Representatives to acquire that practical grasp and moral insight. Our representative form of government envisaged lawmakers who would be able in a reflective and objective attitude to consider the vital issues of the day. Two years is simply too short a time.

Consider the situation of the new Congressman. He must, first of all, familiarize himself with the procedure by which Congress conducts the public business. He must necessarily do this before he gets down to the public business itself. This procedure must become second nature to him and he must become a real member of the family before he can begin to realize his potentialities as a legislator. He must organize his office staff, hire assistants and assign jobs in such a way as to provide himself with the best possible service. It is no small task and requires a considerable amount of time, especially in the beginning. The new Congressman has been sent to Congress by his constituents to deal with national issues and to perform the public business. Two years, I believe, even without considering the time required to get an office staff in motion, is not enough time to acquire the understanding of the great issues that face this Republic.

Now, no sooner has the new Congressman been elected, no sooner has he arrived to undertake his legislative duties, than he is compelled to face up to the necessity of reelection. With a two-year term, the very next year is an election year for the Representative during the First Session of Congress. His whole political future, in order to remain in a position to represent most effectively his political spectrum, depends on his re-election. Can it be expected of him that he will not feel pressured to devote a good part of his energy to maintaining the Support of his constituents?

During my fourteen years as a Member of Congress, I have only had opposition in three primary elections and I have had no opponent in the general elections. It was necessary for me during my fourth year in Congress to absent myself for six weeks to campaign and, again, after ten years in Congress it was necessary for me to absent myself for approximately the same amount of time, while this last year I was away for approximately four months in a primary campaign that, I regret to say, was unsuccessful.

For the record, may I be permitted to point out that when the Florida State Legislature combined my Eighth Congressional District with the Ninth Congressional District, represented by my friend and opponent, I had ten thousand less registered Democratic voters in my district than he had in his. This was a disadvantage that I could not overcome. To go on, however, with the problem of absence from Conrgess, both I and my opponent, let me repeat, were away for approximately four months of this Second Session of the Eighty-Ninth Congress. We, in Florida, are fortunate in that our primary elections are over in May and we have a chance to be present for the debate and votes on most of the critical issues facing Congress. From January of this year through May 3, the date of our first primary election in Florida, there were 82 quorum calls and yea and nay votes in the House. Since then, as of July 1, there have been 75, and there probably will be at least that many more before this session of Congress is adjourned. However, those of my colleagues in Florida who have Republican opposition must concern themselves about the campaign before the November election.

Let me emphasize that, in my opinion, one of the most stressing problems of a Congressman is how to campaign and remain an effective Member of Congress during that period of campaigning. There are those who say that campaigning should be done the year around. The question is, that since Congress now meets ten, eleven, and even twelve months a year, at what time of the session would you get official permission to go home and campaign? The adjournment dates of Congress during the past six years have been as follows: in 1960, on September 1; in 1961, on September 27; in 1962, on October 13; in 1963, on December 30; in 1964, on October 3; and last year, 1965, on October 23. This year most of us, I believe, would agree that we are certainly going to be here for several more months.

Let me emphasize the negative effect of a Congressman's absence, due to campaigning, on his committee work. In Congress, as we know, legislation is largely by committee. The precise and tedious details of legislation are the responsibilities of the committees. The Congressman's presence is as essential in a committee meeting as it is during the debate and final vote on an issue on the Floor of the House.

So, certainly, if a Congressman could be elected for a four year term, the fact of absenteeism should be tremendously reduced.

I believe that a four year term would give a Member of Congress a more secure feeling which, in turn, would give him a freedom which he must have in order to devote himself, heart and soul, to his legislative duties. I do not mean to imply that concern for political success and devotion to legislative duty are necessarily contradictory. They may or may not be. The motivation involved in one is likely to be different from that involved in the other. Elected Representatives are not meant to enjoy absolute political security. That would contradict the meaning and efficacy of representative government, but the relative political insecurity and apprehension engendered by too frequent elections are obstacles, I maintain, to wholehearted devotion to the public business. I say this in the knowledge of the numbers of Congressmen who, much to their credit, have risen above such insecurity and have demonstrated complete dedication to the public business to be done in Washington.

It is my conviction, Mr. Chairman, that both the future role of Congress in national affairs and the fundamental interests of constituents would be enhanced by the four year term for Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the fundamental interests of our constituents are, first, the preservation of genuinely representative government. By this, I mean that the rights and interests of constituents are put forward and effectively represented in the very process by which we formulate law. If Congressmen are handicapped in acquiring a comprehensive grasp of difficult and complex problems so that effective power begins to pass to the Executive Branch, to that extent, the rights and interests of constituents will not be properly represented in the process of making decisions which affect their lives. The second fundamental interest of constituents is the public interest as it incorporates their own legitimate interests. Certainly it would be to the advantage of the American people, as constituents of the House of Representatives, for each member to be given a better chance to contribute a comprehensive knowledge of factors and a deeper moral insight toward a furtherance of the public interest. With a better chance to deal with the public issues which a four year term would afford, every Member of the House would be able to demonstrate more conclusively his qualifications as a lawmaker and constituents would be able to judge his qualifications more effectively.

I believe that a four year term for Members of Congress would reduce expenditures for political purposes and to me this is one of the most necessary problems which demands our attention as we consider this important matter. I believe that on the average a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, to be re-elected when he is opposed, has to spend fifty thousand dollars. Some Members of Congress have to spend two or three times this amount. Others spend less. Up until this current year, during my fourteen years in Congress, I have only had to spend a little over thirty thousand dollars in all my campaigns. My expenditures for the primary campaign this year amounted to approximately fifty thousand dollars. The adequate financing of a political campaign is, let me repeat, one of the greatest problems that confronts us.

If only Americans would individually give a small amount to the candidate of their choice without extracting from him any political promise! But, seemingly, they are not going to do this. It means then that if you have a campaign every two years you are going to have to spend a tremendous amount of time seeking campaign contributions, that do not obligate you, in sufficient amounts to carry on the necessary advertising program that is essential to being elected. Surely I believe we can agree that to run a campaign every four years would be less expensive than to run one every two years. I recognize that this matter is of basic interest to the candidate and not to the constituent. I maintain, however, that with less worry about the financial aspects of campaigning, the Congressman can apply himself to the problems of his constituency in a much more effective fashion.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it is my conviction that a four year term would advance the interests of Congress, as such; the interests of Congressmen; and the interests of the American people as constituents of the House of Representatives. Let me add that as a defeated Congressman a four year term will be of no help to me. It will, though, in my opinion, be of tremendous value to a number of dedicated public servants whose service to our country will be greatly enhanced.

Large Ice Cube Causes Large Headache

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the article which I am about to insert in the Record conceals in a colorful title what could have been a tragic situation. This article, written by a constituent of mine who is commander of the Quad City Squadron of the U.S. Power Squadrons, for their publication the Ensign, describes the ice jam which occurred in the Mississippi River at Davenport, Iowa, this February. In graphic terms Cmdr. Alan Hathaway tells of the danger which the ice jam brought to the Quad Cities area and of a possible long-range preventive measure, that of maintaining an ice-free channel to Dubuque, Iowa.

A resolution providing for a study of the feasibility of such an undertaking has been approved at my urging by the Public Works Committee and I hope that this is but the first step in maintaining year-round navigation on this section of the Mississippi.

The article follows:

Large Ice Cube Causes Large Headache

(By Cmdr. Alan D. Hathaway, AP, Quad City Squadron)

What do you do with an ice cube 10 miles long, up to 12 feet thick, and one river wide?

In February 1966, a quirk of nature reintroduced an age-old problem that, under most circumstances, has no ready solution. The Upper Mississippi River and many other northern rivers periodically suffer from ice jams, but the jam this winter had particular significance, not only because of its huge size, but also because its location threatened to flood the Quad Cities of Davenport and Bettendorf, Ia., and Rock Island and Moline, Ill., for the second time in 10 months.

Just 11 months ago, the area suffered the worst flood in history, due to the rampaging Mississippi. Now the extreme cold temperature that prevailed for a 10-day period, following an early breakup of unusually heavy ice, caused an ice jam below Davenport that grew daily and literally froze to the bottom of the Mississippi. As much as 40 percent of the flow was being held back, and at one time the water at the upper edge of the jam was 10 feet higher than at the lower end, 10 miles downstream!

Local anxiety was high, as one Squadron member can attest after many sleepless nights. (His house is on an island that was surrounded by ice!) Much discussion was generated as to the best method of breaking the jam. An early and logical suggestion, dynamite, was vetoed by the State of Iowa, on advice of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, as too dangerous and probably too ineffectual on such a large accumulation of ice. It was estimated that one million pounds of dynamite would be needed!

Finally, experts from the Corps of Engineers were brought in to survey the problem, and their conclusion was that, if it couldn't be blown up, it must be melted.

The use of lamp black spread over the surface of the ice to absorb the sun's heat and thus melt the ice rapidly was suggested. This method had been used in salt-water harbors in Russia, with good results, but there was no record of its use on fresh water. Another way of melting the ice, through the application of salt, was considered. But the temperatures were too cold, and the towns downstream use the Mississippi River water for drinking purposes. The chance of pollution almost ruled this choice out.

Colonel Howard B. Coffman, Jr., District Engineer of the Rock Island District of the Corps of Engineers, decided to implement several test plans as yet unproven. In one of them, coal dust, instead of lamp black, was spread from crop-dusting planes and helicopters over the lower end of the gorge to cause heat-absorption melting. In another plan, calcium chloride was spread over the ice in other areas to cause chemical melting. Although it was felt that this chemical would cause the least pollution of the stream, it was tried only in small quantities.

Another way to solve the problem was to try and break up the ice with icebreakers. But the only icebreaker on the Upper Mississippi was located 100 miles upstream and frozen in the ice. The icebreaker from St. Louis was available, but not powerful enough, and, besides, Lock 20, downstream, was out of operation for repairs.

Some solution had to be found; already the water was four feet over flood stage in the city of Davenport. Mayors, governors, congressmen, senators, generals, admirals, experts, and citizens—all came to Davenport to survey the jam and make suggestions.

Two large towboats and the U.S. Coast Guard cutter from St. Louis finally arrived at the scene, after hasty repairs were completed to Lock 20 at Canton, Mo. The two boats worked as a team, with one breaking a path through the ice and the other keeping the channel cleared downstream.

Finally, the combination of coal dust, calcium chloride, boats, and the return of warmer temperatures broke the jam!

The follow-up tests showed that the coal dust melted three inches of ice, the calcium chloride melted up to 10 inches, and the boats broke a path 200 feet wide through the jam.

The water went down after the third highest flood in the area's history, caused by ice blocking the river. Old Man River is back to normal now, but there will be much further discussion as to the best way to break up another ice jam in his gullet, should it occur next winter.

Some solution to the problem may be forthcoming from legislation introduced by Congressman John Schmidhauser of Iowa. He requests a feasibility report from the Corps of Engineers on a 12-month navigation season on the Upper Mississippi as far north as Dubuque, Ia. This would go far toward increased flood control, the major aim of this legislative action.

Rusk in Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the circumstances are propitious for Secretary of State Rusk's tour of the Far East.

In fact, the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin describes the atmosphere in that part of the world as improved far beyond anything that could have been predicted 6 months ago.

The newspaper remarks that Secretary Rusk could report military and political advances in South Vietnam. And it declares that striking changes in the entire area would not have taken place had not the United States held firm in South Vietnam.

Because this is an aspect of the Secretary's trip that should not be overlooked, I include the editorial in the RECORD:

SECRETARY RUSK IN THE FAR EAST

> Secretary of State Rusk is making a Far East tour in an atmosphere improved far beyond anything that could have been predicted six months ago. Mr. Rusk could not report to the annual meeting of the Southeast Asia Treaty Oraganization in Canberra, Australia, that peace in Viet Nam was only a day or two away, but he could say that the military situation was never better and that Saigon's political troubles had eased.
>
> But it is the change in the region outside Viet Nam that is the most striking, a change that would not have taken place had the United States not made the stand it has in support of South Viet Nam. The Red Chinese-Indonesian axis has been broken and the Sukarno guerrilla campaign against Malaysia has gone with it. Nine Asian countries have created an Asian and Pacific Council, and the defunct Association of Southeast Asia has been revived. The talk is going beyond economic and technical collaboration toward establishing a permanent organism.
>
> Mr. Rusk will visit Tokyo, Taipei, Manila and Seoul before returning to Washington, all of which capitals are involved in what may be called the new Asian spirit. The secretary will find Japan cautiously emerging from its postwar isolation and playing a leading role in the formation of the Asian and Pacific Council. This is all to the good, and it heralds the necessity for a realignment in the not distant future of our relations with Japan.
>
> The light is still dim, but it is brighter than any that the secretary has had to travel by in previous journeys to the Far East.

The Late Police Chief William H. Parker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, Police Chief Parker was one of our Nation's great law-enforcement officers and one of the new breed of men who helped to revolutionize the police profession in the United States.

He will be remembered both for the efficiency and effectiveness of his department and for the personal standard of integrity which he maintained.

He was equal to the challenges of the unique period in which he lived. He distinguished himself during a time of great tension and strife in American society.

We hope that he was not irreplaceable. But to his great credit there is much evidence to suggest he was.

Address by Congressman Graham Purcell at the Conference of the Americas on "Malnutrition as a Vital Factor in Development," at the Hotel El Continental, Panama, June 20, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, recently the House of Representatives passed and sent to the Senate the Food For Freedom Act of 1966. Within days after the House action, a very exciting demonstration of Latin America on the move in the war against hunger was given in Panama when more than 175 Latin American leaders representing 17 countries, from government, business, church organizations, and other voluntary groups met under the auspices of the Bureau for Latin American Affairs of the Agency for International Development. The purpose of the Conference was to build an action program for a campaign against malnutrition. The theme of the Conference was "Malnutrition—A Vital Factor in Socio-Economic Development." At the conclusion of this Conference, a document was prepared which has become known among those who participated as the "Charter of Panama for Children."

Mr. Speaker, life in Latin America continues to be very grim. Recently the World Health Organization released some tragic facts:

> Among children aged one to four, about half the deaths are attributable to malnutrition.
>
> From the Rio Grande to Cape Horn in every second coffin carried toward a grave is the body of a child who could live no longer than five years.

Added to this is the recent report by some leading nutritionists in Latin America that by any standard acceptable in the United States, 7 out of 10 people in Latin America would be considered malnourished.

Action is indeed needed. It is for this reason that I am very proud to announce that a fellow Texan and good friend, the distinguished Congressman GRAHAM PURCELL, addressed that Conference and brought to the Latin American leaders the strong conviction, presented just a few days before when the vote was taken on the Freedom From Hunger Act, that the American people are committed to freedom from hunger for all men. Surely he spoke for all of us when he said:

> We pledge our best efforts to support those governments and those people who are committing their own resources to the War Against Hunger.
>
> Carry home to your countries the message that the Members of the United States Congress . . . and all our fellow countrymen, are committed to that battle.

I believe his speech is a message not only for the Latin American leaders present in Panama, but I believe this speech is truly a useful message to all peoples who have a national will and determination to help themselves in the struggle against want.

Congressman PURCELL's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN GRAHAM PURCELL AT THE CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAS ON MALNUTRITION AS A VITAL FACTOR IN DEVELOPMENT, PANAMA, JUNE 20, 1966

> I welcome this opportunity, and consider it a great privilege to share with you, the leaders in the campaign against malnutrition, some of the concern of the people of the United States and some of the legislative activities of the United States Congress which are planned to help those who are underfed and undernourished.
>
> President Johnson has taken a bold lead in the fight against hunger. He has made the position of our people clear in his messages to the Congress . . . and the Congress has responded. They have indicated by their actions and speeches that this is the kind of fight the people of my country prefer to respond to . . . The War against Hunger.
>
> While the United States is generally thought of as being affluent and its people as being well-fed, our Congress has recognized that we are not without our own problems involving hunger and malnutrition.
>
> Mindful of this, and of the economic advantages that accrue to a society where each and every member is properly nourished, President Johnson recently proposed the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. The Congress, fully aware that children are one of our most valuable assets, is currently working on this proposal.
>
> Specifically, the Congress is trying to expand the National School Lunch Program to reach more needy children. The program already is serving 18 million children on a regular basis. The Special Milk Program is being expanded to provide more milk for children who need it. We are experimenting with the concept of a Pilot School Breakfast Program which will be tried in low-income areas. Grants are being made to schools to develop additional food service facilities and better staffing of these facilities.
>
> The Food Stamp Plan is another domestic program designed to fight malnutrition. Through this program, recipient families have increased their consumption of quality foods, such as meat, fruits, and vegetables, by more than 80%. President Johnson now visualizes that more than 1.3 million people will be receiving Food Stamp help a year from now.
>
> Legislation which has been receiving a growing amount of enthusiasm in my country these past few months is the Food for Freedom Program.
>
> For the past eleven years, the United States through the Food for Peace Program under Public Law 480 has delivered 150 million tons of food, valued at more than $15 billion, to nations needing more food. Seventy million children now receive United States food, and yet, the problem of world hunger is more serious today than ever before.
>
> On this premise . . . that the problem of world hunger is more serious today than ever before . . . the Food for Freedom program was conceived. I had hoped to be able to share the details of our program with you at this Conference, but they are still being formulated by the United States Congress. An emphasis on self-help and the elimination of the "surplus" concept in food aid will, however, be the main features that distinguished this new program from its predecessors. By the elimination of the "surplus" concept, I mean we will begin to produce for recognized needs rather than shipping only foods which are in surplus. Also, under the new program, there will be increasing stress on nutrition . . . especially for young people.
>
> In our work on the problems of hungry people, there is one item in particular which

is having great impact. That is the so-called "world population explosion." This problem, and the related threat of famine, have been the quiet concern of many of us in the Congress for several years.

Suddenly, however, the problem has been brought into focus by the interest of the public press, by the famine in India, by the heavy purchases of wheat by communist bloc countries that cannot under their system develop a productive farm program, and by the reduced stockpiles in my own country.

The problem is a complex one, and one which deserves lengthy and intensive study. But unfortunately we do not have time to give it the study it needs. The problem is here—now—and time is fleeting.

Certainly at the heart of the problem is the fantastic growth rate of our world's population. I know many of you are more familiar with the staggering statistics than I am, for you face this problem in your own countries. To show how serious it is, however, total world-wide food production in 1965 was about the same as it was in 1964. But, in 1965, there were 63 million more mouths to feed than the year before—more than enough to populate a good-sized country.

Today, there are more human beings in the world who are underfed and undernourished than the population of the entire world in 1900.

Another part of the problem of growing populations and less food for each person lies in the fact that some of the old answers are no longer available. When the United States was developing, the answer to our increasing population was for people to move on to new territory and to open virgin land for farm production. There are no longer such promising frontiers in the United States, and very few in the rest of the world.

All over the world, the most valuable land is already under cultivation. Much of the land which is not in use, or only slightly used, is either too cold, or too dry, or too rough, or too hot, or too wet, or too remote, and does not offer the immediate potential we need.

With the increasing population, and an inability to find new land readily available for easy production, the less-developed areas of the earth are losing their battle to feed themselves. Before World War II, these less-developed regions exported an average of eleven million tons of grain per year to the more developed areas. Since then, the situation has been reversed and these less-developed regions, which are now the areas of highest population growth, have to import more than 20 million tons annually from the developed regions.

A third problem is the increasing number of people who are living in the cities where they cannot supply even a portion of their own food. They are becoming increasingly dependent upon the extremely complex marketing distribution system.

Although half of the world's population still is classified as agricultural, people are beginning to pile up at a faster and faster rate in our cities. This may contribute to economic growth and industrial progress, but—in the case of food—it means that many, many millions of people are at the mercy of imported supplies. It also means that the ability of the rural areas to expand food production easily and quickly under conditions of crisis is more limited than it might be otherwise.

Another problem area which needs study is that of increasing productivity of land already under cultivation. Increasing the yield, the nutritive value, efficiency of harvest, storage, and distribution are problems which must be solved. Unfortunately, answers to these problems will not solve our immediate situation, but do hold great promise for the future.

Along this line I want to report a major breakthrough in developing the nutritive value of food. Purdue University has just recently identified a new genetic component which nearly doubles the protein level of corn and other grains. AID is now initiating a project to make this discovery available in Latin America. This is one of the most exciting food discoveries in recent years and is a real triumph in our struggle against malnutrition.

Another consideration to the problem is the fact that people all over the world are seeking and expecting better diets. Those who do not have the benefit of adequate nutrition see others around them eating their fill. We, in the Congress, know that our citizens will not tolerate a program which might reduce the availability of reasonably priced food in our own country. We also know that people in any other part of the world are no different in this respect. When they become accustomed to a diet of good food, they tend to react strongly to any reduction. Friendly governments can get into serious difficulties with their people when their food supply is curtailed, for any reason.

In short, temporary programs which merely whet the appetite of our people must be avoided unless we are also prepared by means of long-range programs to be sure the people will be fed equally well in the future.

There is another problem which I feel has been a significant contributor to the international food crisis. For centuries, it has been an economic truth that industrial societies can be built only on a sound agricultural foundation. Too many of the developing countries have ambitions of becoming industrial nations and have failed to understand that they must first develop a sound agricultural base. Too many national economic plans have milked the agricultural sector of the economy of necessary capital to spend it on unnecessary, or poorly planned, industrial adventures . . . or both . . . and some have even squandered their national resources and economic resources on petty external or internal wars. This reduces both the total food supply, and the incentive for production.

These are only a few of the problems which must be faced if the people in our hemisphere, and in the rest of the world, are going to be properly fed. There are many other problems of a political, economic, and social nature. I have not even discussed the serious marketing and distribution difficulties. I have not mentioned the physical problems of many of the receiving countries, such as inadequate port facilities. This discussion has not considered the more immediate problems, like drouth. Furthermore, we must recognize the political motives and self-interests of the governments with which we will be working. And, in looking for solutions, we must take into consideration the fact that the countries most in need of food assistance are also the countries least able to pay for it.

There are no easy answers to these problems. There is no neat little legislative package available to us which can solve the world's hunger problem. And so, the United States Congress has been looking for new approaches to a solution of the growing international food crisis.

Massive foreign aid has, in the past, been one of the solutions adopted by the United States. Now, however, it has become very difficult to get approval of these programs in the Congress. It is difficult to explain to our people that they must be taxed to pay for donated supplies of food and other items going to countries who then spend their money for military and other purposes rather than for the development of agriculture. This is particularly true when the military purposes are contrary to the best interests of the United States. It is equally difficult to explain to our constituents that they are being taxed to make up for shortages based on the inability of some recipient nations to collect their own taxes.

Massive foreign aid has other shortcomings. It has a tendency to lead countries to become dependent on donated supplies, rather than encouraging the recipient countries to develop programs for themselves.

Also, such a program tends to develop an appetite of the people for a continuing supply of better food. This, in turn, can create some serious political difficulties between our governments.

And, we do not want to bury a people's pride in an avalanche of well-meaning United States charity. Instead we want to extend a helping hand wherever possible in a manner which will encourage friendly developing countries to work out their own solutions to their individual problems.

We are not looking for dependencies. We are looking for independent partners who will work with the United States to make a better life for men of good will, wherever they may be.

Certainly our solutions much be more than answers to temporary needs for more food. We must also concentrate on finding solutions which show promise of being long term.

First, we must face up to the problem of a rapidly growing population and work on population controls. I recognize that any program in this area will be loaded with economic, political, religious, and social conflict . . . but work must begin.

Last year, for the first time in my country, a Congressional committee held extensive hearings on population controls. The study will be resumed. For the first time, a President of the United States is speaking on the problem. Encouragement has been given by the actions and words of the Pope who is giving new study and thought to the problem.

Within recent months, public attention in the Americas was focused on a significant discussion meeting, held in Cali, Colombia, on problems of population. All these indicators offer hope that positive actions will be taken in the near future to help cope with the population crisis. If you and I have any concern for hungry people, we must press for these answers.

Secondly, people from all the Americas must work together to establish sound agricultural programs. United States food production will not eliminate the food shortage. At best, it can only be a temporary answer to the present food shortage. We want to assist your efforts with our technology and skills in agriculture because we believe, working together, we can find more lasting answers to far greater food production in our hemisphere. In connection with these considerations, President Johnson stated that, "There is one characteristic common to all who have increased the productivity of their farms: A national will and determination to help themselves."

This increase in production will require more fertilizer, technical services, tractors, and other equipment, resulting in new industries and more jobs for your workers. Of course, the United States wants to help supply the needs which you cannot produce at home. Such progress will mean stronger economies, and in all candor, stronger economies and increased trade make better neighbors. It is no secret that crime, disease, and revolution breed and multiply where there is hunger and poverty.

Now, for the first time in our history, my country is in a position in which it can work with you in making real progress against the scourage of hunger. We have a new farm program which gives us much needed flexibility. My fellow countrymen are ready to accept the challenge, for it gives us an opportunity to demonstrate the compassion and concern of our people, a free people, for our fellow man.

We believe that all the American Nations . . . joined together in efforts to conquer our own problems . . . can join together to help others who have even greater problems.

Our creed is simple. Ours is a nation of people còncerned about the problems of individual pepole. Ours is a government which, under God, seeks to serve people rather than be served by people. We cannot, and will not, deny to our citizens either the freedom of opportunity, or food for their bodies. We cannot be true to these principles, and at the same time, ignore the problems of hungry people elsewhere in the world.

President Johnson has told us:

"There is a great moral principle at stake. It is not right . . . in a world of such infinite possibilities . . . that children should die of hunger, that young people should live in ignorance, that men should live in misery, shrouded in despair.

"If we truly mean our commitment to freedom, we must help strike at the conditions which make a mockery of that hope.

"We have the skills and resources to improve the life of men. I do not believe we lack the imagination to find ways to shatter the barrier between man's capacity and man's needs."

When the President presented the Food for Freedom program to the Congress, he pointed out that when "men and their families are hungry, poorly clad and ill-housed, the world is restless—and civilization exists at best in troubled peace."

For Americans of both North and South America, there is only one answer. We must turn our collective, creative abilities loose on the problem of food production and together develop the great agriculture productive capacity we possess to feed hungry people wherever they may live.

You, the leaders assembled here today, have accepted this challenge. Your presence at this Conference makes this clear.

You know we will not have an easy victory. The struggle will be long and arduous, but I ask you . . . what better war could mankind be engaged in than one to achieve "Freedom from Hunger" for all men?

As a member of the United States Congress, I believe I speak for all my colleagues when I say "We pledge our best efforts to support those governments and those people who are committing their own resources to the War against Hunger."

Carry home to your countries the message that the Members of the United States Congress . . . and all our fellow countrymen, are committed to that battle.

Remarks of Congressman Samuel N. Friedel, of Maryland, Har Sinai Congregation, Baltimore, May 29, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, recently the Har Sinai Temple in my city of Baltimore retired a historic U.S. flag, and replaced it with a new one. That temple houses America's oldest continuous Reform Jewish congregation and is a beautiful edifice in a city noted for the striking architecture of its churches.

The new flag presented to the temple was flown over our Capitol on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the writing of "The Star-Spangled Banner."

One of the speakers at Har Sinai Temple on May 29, 1966, was my distinguished and able colleague, Congressman SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, who has ably served his city, State, and Nation. We, here, in the Congress of the United States are indeed, proud of him and his invaluable contributions as a legislator and statesman. When I read my colleague's statement, I was so favorably impressed that I wish to have it inserted in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, believing it to be of general interest and worthy of further notice.

Congressman FRIEDEL's remarks are as follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, MARYLAND, HAR SINAI CONGREGATION, BALTIMORE, MAY 29, 1966

Dr. Shusterman, Rabbi Simon, Cantor Cooper, officers and fellow members of Har Sinai Congregation:

We are gathered here today to retire our historic flag and replace it with a new one. This banner which has flown over this house of God will long be remembered as the one which was actually flown over our Capitol in Washington on the 150th anniversary of the writing of our national anthem—The Star Spangled Banner.

It is, therefore, proper that this ensign be placed among the archives of our temple and forever treasured for its historic significance. The Har Sinai Congregation, America's oldest continuous Reform Jewish religious organization, has at all times placed patriotism for the United States immediately after duty and love for the Lord.

The story of the origin of our national flag parallels the story of the origin of our country. As our country received its birthright from the peoples of many lands who were gathered on these shores to found a new nation, so did the pattern of our stars and stripes rise from antiquity. The star is a symbol of the heavens and the divine goal to which man has aspired from time immemorial; the stripe is symbolic of the rays of light emanating from the sun. Its colors also inspire us—red stands for courage, white is the symbol of purity, and blue is the color of justice.

Here, in the presence of representatives of all Har Sinai activities, its officers, board of trustees, brotherhood, sisterhood, Boy Scout organizations, youth groups, and the entire temple family, we respectfully retire this flag and replace it with a similar flag that has also flown over our Nation's Capitol in Washington.

Bail Reform Act of 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the recently passed Bail Reform Act of 1966 (S. 1357) is the first significant change in the basic Federal bail procedures that were established by the Judiciary Act of 1789. It now enables Federal prisoners without sufficient funds to raise bail to obtain a pretrial release.

The bill requires judicial officers to "release on personal recognizance or on unsecured bond persons charged with noncapital Federal offenses," unless the officer determines that later appearance is "not reasonably" assured. It also establishes certain conditions under which the prisoner may be released, in order to assure his appearance at trial. Under this bill, the officer must take various factors into account. He must fully consider the record of the accused, his family ties, financial resources, and other important facets of the case.

President Johnson recognized the necessity of this legislation when he advocated its .passage in his message on crime and law enforcement and when he signed it into law. In view of its importance, I now place into the RECORD an editorial broadcast over WHO radio in Des Moines, Iowa:

THE CHANGE IN THE FEDERAL BAIL LAW

President Johnson has signed into law a bill that will result in many federal prisoners being released without bond to await their trial.

The effect of the legislation is limited; it applied only to Federal Courts, to charges involving noncapital crimes and to persons who are not considered dangerous and who can be trusted to show up for trial.

Judging by the success of the pre-trial release program in Des Moines, a surprisingly high percentage of persons charged can be trusted to return voluntarily for their trial.

For those who are released under the program it means they will not have to serve time simply because they don't have money, nor will they have to pay an exorbitant rate of interest to a professional bondsman to gain their release. It will give even more meaning to the principle that a person is innocent until he has been proven guilty.

The passage of the law is a significant step in improving the quality of justice in the Federal Courts.

Free Postage to Combat Zones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation which would provide for free postage on first-class mail, newspapers, and small parcels for *all citizens sending that mail to members of the U.S. Armed Forces serving in combat zones.*

I was surprised to discover that no Members of Congress has introduced legislation of this sort before; I would certainly hope that H.R. 16389 is given immediate and serious consideration so that this situation can be quickly alleviated. Under this bill, mail will be sent by air on a space-available basis on U.S.-flag carriers to combat zones, as designated by the President.

On November 1, 1965, Public Law 89-315, giving free postal privileges to soldiers in combat areas and providing for air service on the free mail, was signed by President Johnson and enacted into law. On March 21 of this year, the House passed H.R. 13448 which would provide for airmail from the United States to combat zone areas at surface continental rates. This measure has not yet been acted upon by the full Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Although it was encouraging to see the public law signed and it was heartening to see the House pass the latter measure, neither goes far enough in terms of giving servicemen the maximum opportunities to receive mail.

I received a letter from a constituent in South River, N.J., who told me:

> I am thinking of older people who depend on social security for their only income. For people in this category and people on relief it would sometimes almost be impossible to send even a small package to Vietnam.
>
> Why must it be so costly to send a small box of hope, love and a bit of home to the GI's who are so bravely sacrificing their lives for our country.

Now, it may cost up to $4.08 to send a 5-pound parcel air mail from New York to San Francisco, the point of embarkation for Asian mail. To many families, this may prove to be a heavy financial burden.

Here is a situation where some 300,000 soldiers are engaged in a fight for their very lives—the least we at home could do would be to insure these men some small measure of the comforts of home. It is unfair both to the members of the Armed Forces and their parents who may be prohibited by costs from sending them news from home or small packages.

It is bad for morale as well. In a communication to Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien, the President has said:

> Mail is the vital link that bridges vast distances, bringing warmth and news and, most important, easing the pain of separation. To have mail delivered sooner is to bring home that much closer.

It goes without saying that, to paraphrase the President, to have mail delivered more often is also to bring home that much closer.

It is a well-known fact that mail call is one of the few bright spots of the day of a soldier in combat. If we in Washington can make this moment a bit happier, then, I think that we can say that we are doing our part.

What is more, this bill will not be a burden on the taxpayers. I have been informed by Mr. Eugene B. Crowe, Acting Assistant Postmaster General of the Post Office Department, that revenue loss on first-class letters and small parcels going to Vietnam—based on a survey made at the San Francisco Post Office—terminal for all U.S. mail going to Vietnam—will be only $1.6 million. Although $1.6 million is not a figure which one usually precedes with "only," we must put the cost in the proper perspective of the entire war. Although official figures are not available, it is likely that we are spending $20 billion a year or more in Vietnam. In comparison to that figure, $1.6 million is but a minute fraction.

Eric Sevareid has pointed out that it costs about $1 million for each member of the Vietcong that American forces kill in action. This additional cost of $133,000 a month will not be great at all.

In addition, we have set precedents in past wars of giving soldiers mailing privileges home. Now, I feel that an extra measure is necessary so that soldiers are not faced with the problem which was reported by Mrs. Walter Glynn, national president of the American Legion Auxiliary:

> A serviceman in Da Nang portrayed the plight of those who receive little mail when he wrote "Although I would like a hometown newspaper, I have a friend who needs one more than I do. He does not receive much mail; in fact, if he receives a letter once every two weeks, he's lucky. Some time ago he told me that if he had his hometown newspaper, he would not miss mail so much.

Certainly, if there is any body of American citizens which ought to receive special compensation from the Government, it is those soldiers serving in combat areas. I believe that my bill, H.R. 16389, by giving these men the added "bonus" pleasure of hearing from loved ones and friends, would help provide a needed and vital service for our men in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for speedy and positive action on my legislation.

California Loses a Distinguished Conservationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Golden State of California lost one of its most distinguished citizens who was a conservationist of world renown.

During his 91 years, Dr. Charles M. Goethe played a major role in the development of our national park system and also in the fostering of recreation areas not only in this country but in many areas throughout the world with especial emphasis on areas attractive to our children.

Early in my career of public service I was privileged to become acquainted with this outstanding man who, I should point out, was born at Lake Tahoe at a time when this world-famed recreation spot was still known only to the hardiest of pioneers. In my own association with Dr. Goethe, I was honored to work with him toward the development of the American River, including the construction of the Folsom Dam and Reservoir, the conservation projects on Middle Fork, and the developments on the South Fork constructed by the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District, and, finally, with the Auburn Dam project which was authorized by this Congress just in the last year.

Paying tribute to this distinguished citizen of California, the Sacramento Bee, which serves most of northern California, published an outstanding editorial. It is my pleasure to include this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

> Sacramento has lost one of its most distinguished and honored citizens in the death of Charles M. Goethe.
>
> And while he was a native of this city it also can be said of him that in a very real sense he was a citizen of the world, so wide ranging were his interests and so diversified the activities to which he devoted his time and a goodly portion of his fortune as well.
>
> In business, he was most successful. And to those who knew him best it appeared he coveted material success not so much for its intrinsic value but because it provided him with the means and the leisure to promote the philanthropic, conservation and religious causes which were closest to his heart.
>
> To enumerate these would take an article encyclopedic in length.
>
> Typical of them were such activities as the establishment of the ranger naturalist service in our country's national parks, the fostering of the kindergarten movement, the establishment of children's playgrounds not only in the United States but in many foreign countries as well, the saving of the redwoods for the enjoyment of generations yet to come, the promotion of the junior museums, the establishment of the Everglades National Park in Florida which resulted in the salvation of the egrets.
>
> A naturalist, he was the Audubon of his time as the nature series he long has contributed to The Bee gives wide and varied illustration.
>
> And he richly deserved the rare distinction for an American of being elected to a fellow of the British Royal Arts Society.
>
> Goethe and his wife, Mary Glide Goethe, for many years spent six months of each year in travel primarily to learn about the flora and fauna and peoples of distant lands. His knowledge of these was both varied and intimate. They were a constant wonder to those who talked with him. He had a passion for knowing and understanding.
>
> Yet he himself was not always understood, for his ways of helping others with finances, with kindness, were known only to a few. But the scope of the material aid he passed along monthly, especially to young people and to groups working with or for young people, was so very wide, the total sum of his assistance had to be large.
>
> Scholarships, vacations, blocks of tickets for the children's theater—the list of his gratuities was very long indeed, still the donor always remained modestly in the background.
>
> Goethe's life was one fruitful and rich in human satisfactions far beyond the usual.
>
> And it can be said with truthfulness that the world was made a happier and better place because he walked this way.
>
> He may be gone but the good he did will continue to endure as long as little children romp in playgrounds and as long as people gather around campfires to listen with eager minds to rangers relating to them the wonders of the great out of doors.

The Coast Guard in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, for a year, Squadron 1 of the U.S. Coast Guard has been prowling the coastal waters of Vietnam charged with sharing the responsibility of halting the movement by water of men and supplies from North Vietnam to Vietcong units in the south. In order that the contribution of the Coast Guard to the war effort may be more fully understood and appreciated, I include in today's RECORD, H. R. Kaplan's article "The Coast Guard in

Vietnam," from the June 1966 edition of Navy magazine:

THE COAST GUARD IN VIETNAM

(By H. R. Kaplan)

Half way around the world, in the South China Sea, the United States Coast Guard's Squadron One is keeping watch over the sea approaches to the embattled Republic of Viet Nam. Its mission is to bar movement by water of men and materials from North Viet Nam to Viet Cong units in the south. It's an objective more easily stated than accomplished.

Squadron One has been in Viet Nam waters since last July, when the first units arrived via the Philippines. Operating under the direction of the United States Navy, the Squadron's twenty-six 82-foot patrol boats, together with Navy units and naval craft of the Republic of Viet Nam, make up the Coastal Surveillance Force. The Force is a major part of the sea war being waged by the United States and its allies to prevent a Communist take-over.

Day and night, seven days a week, units of the small Coast Guard fleet prowl the seemingly placid coastal waters of Viet Nam on the lookout for infiltration from the sea. The land they guard is, in many ways, a beautiful one, with dazzling white beaches, lofty mountains and green valleys. But it is a land scarred by war. Its dense forests and jungles conceal Viet Cong soldiers. Its people are terrorized by marauding Communist guerrillas.

Like other servicemen in Viet Nam, the men of Squadron One must endure the loneliness of being in a distant part of the world, far removed from our own in customs, language and tradition. There is also the intense heat, ranging from 90 to 120 degrees, high humidity and the drenching seasonal rains that make life difficult.

In the 11 months the men of Squadron One have been at their job, they have become veterans. They've learned that war in Viet Nam is a hard, grinding, unglamorous affair, filled with unpleasant surprises. That innocent looking junk can suddenly become a blazing instrument of death. Those mild looking fishermen may be Viet Cong soldiers armed with grenades and other weapons. So the one rule you keep uppermost in your mind is: Don't relax. It could mean your life.

The patrol function carried out by the Squadron has the intriguing title, "Operation Market Time". It's a curiously peaceful name for so dangerous a mission. No one knows exactly how it received its name, but one theory is that it was derived from the thousands of commercial junks plying these waters daily. In this part of the world, where refrigeration facilities are virtually nonexistent, the junks serve as floating markets. These marine markets have sometimes provided the Viet Cong with opportunities for smuggling men and supplies into battle zones.

THE VUNG RO CAPER

What finally brought the matter of sea infiltration to a head was the discovery in February, 1965, of a large arms cache in Vung Ro Bay by members of the U.S. and Vietnamese navies. A 130-foot camouflaged junk had been sighted by a helicopter while on a medical mission out of Qui Nhon. Aircraft were called to the scene and four air strikes sank the vessel in shallow water.

Afterwards, investigators found that she was carrying enough supplies to outfit an entire Viet Cong battalion. Her armament was sufficient to knock out any normal-size patrol vessel. From caches on the beach nearby, investigators recovered 1,500 weapons and 30 tons of ammunition, explosives and medical supplies. Most of the equipment was of Red Chinese manufacture. Papers found on the ship clearly showed that it was of North Vietnamese registry and engaged in infiltration.

This episode and several others like it convinced the Navy that something had to be done quickly to halt further infiltration. But Viet Nam's highly indented coastline made it very vulnerable to incursions from the sea. Faced with this problem, the Navy turned to the Coast Guard for assistance. The Navy Command knew that the Coast Guard's fast, highly maneuverable 82-foot patrol craft were ideally suited to the operation. Accordingly, they requested that vessels of this type be made available for close in-shore patrol work along the coast of the Republic of Viet Nam.

The Coast Guard responded by ordering 17 of its 82-footers to Viet Nam duty. On May 26, 1965, at Alameda, California, this force was commissioned as Coast Guard Squadron One. It was an excellent demonstration of the close working partnership that has existed between the two Services throughout our country's history. It is a partnership which has been confirmed many times on the beaches of Guadalcanal, Normandy, Sicily, North Africa and many other places far from the American homeland.

But before the Coast Guard vessels could be sent to the theater of operations, they had to be fitted out with additional armament. This included four 50-caliber machine guns and, as a main battery, a 50-caliber machine gun ingeniously moutned "piggy back" fashion on an 81-millimeter mortar. The mounting was devised by Chief Warrant Gunner Elmer Hicks. Obviously, Coast Guard personnel have not lost their ability to improvise.

Merchant ships carried the 82-footers to Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, which was the shakedown and staging area for the operation. Here the cutters and their crews were paired off for the first time. In the months ahead they would get to know a lot about one another. Each cutter was to carry an 11-man crew and a Vietnamese interpreter.

Before leaving for Viet Nam, Squadron One was split into Divisions 11 and 12. The nine cutters of Division 11 were to operate out of An Thoi on the island of Phu Quoc in the South to seal off the Viet Nam-Cambodian border and to patrol the Viet Nam coast on the Gulf of Thailand. Division 12's eight cutters were to be based at Da Nang and its area of activity was to be near the northern sector of the Republic of Viet Nam just south of the 17th parallel, the border between South Viet Nam and the Communist North. In February, 1966, an additional nine vessels were dispatched to the Squadron, bringing the total to 26. The new unit, Division 13, operates along Viet Nam's central coast and is based at Vung Tau (Cat Lo), about 40 miles south of Saigon.

The stretch of coast patrolled by the Coastal Surveillance Force, of which the Squadron is a part, totals about 750 miles, roughly comparable to the coast of California. That's a lot of water for a small fleet to cover. Working with it are ships and aircraft of the U.S. Navy and naval units of the Republic of Viet Nam.

A TYPICAL DAY

In command of Squadron One is Captain Robert LoForte whose headquarters are in Saigon. His command is composed of about 400 men, including relief crews, maintenance personnel, medical corpsmen and the headquarters staff. He serves directly under the Commander, Naval Forces, Viet Nam, who controls the operations of the entire Coastal Surveillance Force.

What's a typical day on patrol? As a rule it's pretty strenuous. Once a suspicious looking junk is sighted, the cutter heads for it. Boardings are business-like, but courteous. Most of the interrogation is conducted by the Vietnamese officer who checks the junk's registry and the crews' credentials. Inspectors are fully aware of the importance of establishing good relations with the civilian population. Many of the people on the junks are well known to the inspectors through previous boardings. Food packages, medicine, cigarettes and other gift items are distributed. Last Christmas, Squadron One distributed gifts to fishermen and dependent children of personnel of the Vietnamese Navy.

Squadron One's war may not have the heart-quickening tension of the war in the rice paddies and the jungles, but it has some built-in dangers of its own. Take for example the case of the *Point Marone* in Division 11 in the Gulf of Thailand. For more than a month the cutter had been on patrol without incident. To her skipper, Lieutenant David R. Markey of Groton, Conn., it looked very much as though he were never going to see any action in this strange war.

All that changed on August 23, 1965. While patrolling the northern end of Phu Quoc island, Markey spotted a junk headed for Cambodian waters. There was something about her that put Markey on his guard. He ordered pursuit of the craft, overtaking it. The three men on board were taken prisoner and turned over to Vietnamese naval authorities. Later they confessed that they were members of the Viet Cong.

CAPTURE FIRST JUNK

Two days later, on August 25, the cutters *Point Mast, Point Comfort,* and *Point Clear* and a Navy destroyer escort shelled a Viet Cong staging area not far from the Vietnamese Navy Junk Base at An Thoi. Using their 81-millimeter mortars, firing high explosive rounds, they saturated the target area.

On September 19, 1965, the tempo of war really speeded up for Division 11. On that day, a Sunday, *Point Glover* made the first capture of a Viet Cong junk, attempting to infiltrate via the Gulf of Thailand. The action started at 1 a.m. when the cutter detected an unlighted junk in the area and started to close in. At first the junk attempted evasive action. The cutter stopped the junk by smashing her engine with machine gun fire. A boarding party found rifles, including Chinese Communist carbines, 480 rounds of ammunition, cargo and personal effects. One survivor was found by the *Point Garnet,* the other crewmen of the junk were presumed drowned.

On the same hectic Sunday at 11:30 p.m. the *Point Marone* sighted another junk trying to reach the Viet Nam coast on the Gulf of Thailand. The *Marone* fired two warning shots as the junk tried to evade and outmaneuver the cutter. The *Marone's* fire was answered by Communist small arms and grenades. Then the cutter let go with her bow machine gun. During the fight, the *Point Glover* arrived on the scene and illuminated the area with her mortar, providing supporting small arms and machine gun fire. Riddled with bullets, the junk sank soon after it was taken in tow by the *Point Glover*. In the action, 11 Viet Cong were killed. One badly wounded survivor was taken ashore near a U.S. Special Forces Camp at the village of Ha Tien on the mainland. None of the cutters sustained damage.

On the following day, the *Point Young* carried a salvage party to the scene from Division 11's support ship, U.S.S. *Krishna*. From the second junk, the Coast Guard recovered six rifles, ammunition, hand grenades, a large amount of Vietnamese money and documents, confirming that its crew were Viet Cong.

RAMMING ENEMY JUNK

Frequently, the cutters provide gunfire support for ground forces in danger of being overrun by the enemy, assist Viet Nam naval units engaged by the enemy forces, and shell enemy shore installations.

Squadron One racked up another score against the enemy on the evening of March 9, 1966. At 10:15 p.m., the *Point White* of Division 13 spotted a 25-foot motorized junk attempting to cross the Soirap River from the mangrove swamp area designated as the Rung Sat Special Zone. The cutter hailed the junk at a distance of about 150 yards, simultaneously illuminating the area. A savage burst of automatic and small arms fire was the junk's answer. The enemy fire was immediately returned by *Point White's* small arms and 50-caliber machine guns.

The cutter's reply disabled several of the enemy and tore big chunks out of the junk's hull. But the Viet Cong were stubborn and a hail of bullets continued to pour out of the junk. In the face of the continuing fire. *Point White's* skipper, Lieutenant Eugene J. Hickey, ordered full speed ahead to ram the junk. He hit the junk amidships. Within 30 minutes after the ramming, she went down. A fanatical Viet Cong in the forward section kept firing until the vessel sank. Because of his resistance, only four crewmen of the junk were rescued.

On March 19, 1966, *Point Garnet* provided covering fire to permit the withdrawal of a U.S. Special Forces team which had run into an enemy ambush on Phu Quoc island. Because of the *Garnet's* action, the force escaped intact.

NORMALLY STRENUOUS

As these incidents indicate, Squadron One's job is anything but routine. So far, the cutters of Division 12 at Da Nang have been involved in much more offshore work than those of Division 11. But whatever their job, all the men of the Squadron must remain on continual alert and be able to respond instantly to any situation. Even without the outright challenge of the enemy, their normal patrol duty is taxing enough. By the end of December, 1965, the original 17 cutters had inspected nearly 12,500 junks and boarded 9,741. Since then, these totals have gone up tremendously.

Squadron One's divisions work closely with local junk divisions in their patrols, exchanging information and taking frequent occasion to compare notes on suspicious areas, such as approaches to rivers and canals where traffic appears to be heavier than usual. In contrast to peacetime patrols, the Squadron's ships spend more than 70 per cent of their time on patrol. This is well over twice the time underway for similar ships in peacetime. But nobody is complaining and morale is high.

Coast Guardsmen in Viet Nam do have several things going for them. Their ships are airconditioned and the food is up to the usual high Coast Guard standards. Whenever possible, the men are given liberty to rest at recreational facilities at Ha Tien, Vung Tau, and occasionally at Hongkong, Bangkok and other areas. This doesn't happen very often, however. On the relatively rare occasions they go ashore, they are well received by the native population, especially the children to whom Americans are "Okay, Number 1", the highest oriental rating. No. 10 represents the other end of the popularity scale.

Squadron One, of course, is only a small part of the complex and difficult operation now being carried out in Viet Nam. Nevertheless it is an important one. Its men know that a great deal depends on the skill and dedication which they bring to their work.

H.R. 13419

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

(Mr. ROGERS of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the full committee [Mr. ASPINALL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] have rather fully explained the purposes and need for this legislation. I want to reemphasize the fact that we have this legislation before us today because of the desire of the legislative committees to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation with respect to feasibility grade investigations and the preparation of feasibility reports. In other words, this bill implements the limiting provision adopted by the Congress last year when we passed the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. Up until now, since 1902, the Bureau has had general authority to conduct these studies. From now on, each feasibility investigation must be specifically authorized.

The reason for the great number of studies listed in this bill is because this is the first legislation considered since enactment of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. Thus, this bill must provide authority to continue all the investigations underway at the present time, including even those that have been completed where the projects have not been authorized for construction by the Congress. In the future, the Congress will need to authorize only the new planning starts.

The restriction on the Bureau's general authority, approved by the Congress last year, permits the legislative committees to examine these proposed projects at an earlier stage in the planning procedure and to exercise better control over the program. Past experience has shown that, once a project study reaches the feasibility stage, the impression prevails among the people in the local project areas that congressional authorization is pretty much a routine matter and foregone conclusion.

The local people and the local sponsoring groups are usually surprised to learn of possible delays in authorization. They cannot understand why the projects should not immediately be authorized once the feasibility report has been completed. They are unaware of the problem of imbalance between the Bureau of Reclamation's planning program and construction program, and that all of the projects with completed feasibility reports cannot be authorized because of budget ceilings.

Under the new procedure, it will be possible for Members of Congress to be familiar with the studies that are being conducted, and they will not be suddenly confronted with a completed projects report and local pressure for immediate authorization.

Mr. Speaker, as has already been pointed out, the investigations authorized in this legislation will be conducted over a period of at least the next 10 years. These investigations will result in a flow of completed feasibility reports to the Congress and will provide all of the information necessary for Congress to approve those projects that are meritorious and needed. The enactment of this legislation will permit orderly development of plans to meet the ever-growing water problems and needs of the Western United States.

I urge the approval of this legislation.

Happy Half Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I ask our colleagues to join in congratulating Sanford H. Wendover, editor of the Meriden, Conn., Journal, on the completion of his 50th year with the Journal. There is something unique and commendable in the completion of half a century of service with a single employer, but when this service is recognized as eloquent and essential in the public domain it becomes all the more admirable and deserving of commendation.

Editor Wendover was pleasantly surprised by his associates with a 50th anniversary party, complete with cake, candles, flowers, and telegrams and messages from friends and associates from throughout the State and in other parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Editor Wendover's dedication to the task of protecting the community by enlightening the individual, I wish to include here the text of a letter which was addressed to Mr. Wendover by William L. Plante, Jr., president of the New England Society of Newspaper Editors, and a resolution introduced by Alderman Albert Hyman and adopted unanimously by the Court of Common Council of the City of Meriden:

The letter from Mr. Plante is as follows:

> The officers and the governors of the New England Society of Newspaper Editors congratulate you upon your 50 years of service to journalism in New England.
>
> Years alone do not tell the story. Your hard work, your professional competence, your talents as writer and editor, and your role as community leader set a mark for the rest of us to emulate.
>
> The society is proud to number you among its earliest members. It extends to you greetings and best wishes for continuing

good health at this significant point in your career.

The resolution is as follows:

This is probably one of the most unusual resolutions our body will be acting upon because it contains no 'whereases and now therefores.'

The reason is because the man to whom we are paying tribute is one who just won't tolerate the redundancies of our governmental language.

It's not unique in this day and age for a man to be doing the same job for 50 years, but when that job is serving as a responsible critic and conscience to a city it behooves us all to take a brief moment to say thank you.

For his 50 years—celebrated today—as one of the pioneer developers and later leading voice of the Meriden Journal and for his many other years of public service, including terms on the Board of Apportionment and Taxation, this council takes this occasion to say thank you to Sanford H. Wendover, editor, Meriden Journal.

Dr. Teruo Ihara: Add New Dimension to International Understanding by Increasing Grants To "Have Not" Foreign Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, our Government's foreign scholarship program, established by the Congress in 1946, continues to be one of America's most important efforts toward promoting international understanding. And yet, Asia, which is recognized as an acute area in which the United States ought to promote understanding, receives only 4 percent of the total Fulbright scholarships. Western Europe, on the other hand, enjoys approximately 80 percent of the educational exchanges.

Dr. Teruo Ihara, associate professor of education at the University of Hawaii, says that this imbalance in geographic distribution is largely caused by the requirement for fluency in English. He adds that this language requirement has also tended to limit the grantees to those who come from the upper socio-economic level of their country. Dr. Ihara offers some helpful suggestions as to how the selective process might be improved.

Fortunately, Dr. Ihara, who happens to be a personal friend of mine, was recently appointed to the State Department's 12-member Board of Foreign Scholarships, and we will have the benefits of his views.

The newspaper article, written by Judy Chase, summarizing Dr. Ihara's views appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of June 30, 1966. I now submit the article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, June 30, 1966]

MORE GRANTS URGED FOR "HAVE-NOT" FOREIGN STUDENTS

(By Judy Chase)

The United States should concern itself more with ferreting out the "have-not" youngsters of developing foreign countries for student grants, Dr. Teruo Ihara believes.

Ihara, associate professor of education at the University of Hawaii was recently appointed by President Johnson to the U.S. State Department's 12-member Board of Foreign Scholarships.

He said, "we can't get through to these people with handouts.

"The Red Chinese are getting through to them via their minds. We should approach them in the same way."

Ihara was critical of the fact that most Fulbright grants awarded by the board to foreigners go to students who are better off than average socially and economically.

He said the same is true of East-West Center grantees from foreign countries. "All this does is maintain the status quo."

KNOWLEDGE OF ENGLISH

The reason foreign students selected are so homogenous is that selection depends heavily on proficiency in English, Ihara said. The only people who are able to learn English are in the higher socio-economic brackets.

Yet, to keep pace in American graduate schools, he said, any student has to be fluent in English. (All Fulbright grantees are either graduates students, researchers or lecturers.)

Ihara said to solve this dilemma in educational and cultural interchange, he advocates that an intensive English training program be started making all bright foreigners eligible.

The Board of Foreign Scholarships is a blue-ribbon panel including Chairman Oscar Handlin, Warren professor of American history at Harvard; John M. Stalnaker, president of the National Merit Scholarship Corporation; Francis Keppel, assistant secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for education; Brooks Hays, former U.S. congressman from Arkansas, and Arthur Vanderbilt, professor of political affairs at Rutgers University.

Though the board sets the State Department's educational exchange policy and stamps final approval on all Fulbright grants, bi-national commissions recommend the students from foreign countries.

Where none exists, the U.S. embassy's cultural affairs officer makes the recommendations.

CHANGE IN PROCESS

Ihara feels the selection process might be improved by awarding grants to institutions rather than individuals, so that foreign students will be more likely to return home to jobs or studies after their stay in the U.S. than they are now.

"Remaining in the states is a problem which the board recognizes and is seeking to solve, though, of course, it depends on the individual country."

For example, "just about all students who come here from Thailand go back, while Korea has not been as fortunate," he said. Also, "I know many Pakistanis who would dearly love to get out of their country."

Ihara feels, too, that giving the Fulbright grants to institutions both in the U.S. and abroad "would ensure the maximum benefit to all concerned."

AMERICAN STUDENTS

Selection of American students now is based primarily on scholastic achievement and their proposals to tie in a study grant with their own educational experiences and goals.

Preliminary screening is done by the Institute for International Education and the Conference Board.

Though the board puts education before politics, Ihara said, "Sometimes we have to turn students down because the State Department is concerned that on the basis of their past actions in this country, their actions abroad might not be in the best interests of the United States."

Ihara added that the board has a policy under which no explanation is given to a student as to why he has been turned down. He said the reason is that "the large number of students involved makes it impossible."

Personally, Ihara said, "I think it is in the best interest of the United States to have completely free interchange of ideas between the U.S. and foreign countries.

"I think it would be great if we could arrange educational exchanges with Red China, Russia and Indonesia, but these countries are unwilling."

He said the U.S. does have student exchanges with Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia and that Burma and Ceylon recently expressed interest in joining the Fulbright program.

The student exchange program adopted by Congress in 1946 was intended to be a new dimension in international understanding. Despite its shortcomings, Ihara said, "testimonies by return grantees are generally in agreement that increased understanding of Americans has been one of its most important results. And this dispelling of ugly stereotypes about the American people is very important."

Ihara, who has attended two of the board's four annual meetings in Washington since his appointment, said he has several recommendations he plans to make in the future.

As a member of the Far Eastern Committee, he said he will work toward more educational and cultural exchanges with Asia.

"Right now, about 80 percent of the exchanges are with Western Europe, and only four percent with the Far East.

"The Viet Nam and Red China situations being what they are, I think that the next great area of world conflict will be Southeast Asia. If we can help these people to develop their capabilities to carry on viable ongoing societies, it will add to their desire for freedom."

Ihara said he would also like to see more Fulbright grants go to teachers. "Since teachers are the ones who mold the thinking of our children, the benefits of their grants would be multiplied."

Overregulation Can Kill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, in the present issue of American Heritage, there is a very profound article on the regulating of the natural wildlife in our Nation, which stresses the theme that by regulating many of the species of animal life, we are seriously tampering with nature's balance.

In effect, by meeting our problems with short-range solutions, we are multiplying our problems for the future.

In line with the thoughts expressed in American Heritage is an editorial from the Claiborne County, Tenn., Progress, which I insert in the RECORD, stressing its conclusion that—

> Pesticides and their proper use are the difference between abundance and scarcity.

The editorial follows:

OVERREGULATION CAN KILL

Population increases bring inescapable environment changes. Dr. Warren C. Shaw, a top official of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, says that the world's population of humans, domestic animals and wildlife could not exist today in the environment of the past.

In most areas of the world, the native vegetation was not very efficient as a source of food and fiber. Thus, as man developed, he had to replace the native vegetation with more productive plants. The result was an increase in pests too, and in the words of Dr. Shaw, "When man creates ideal conditions for the multiplication of pests, he must also create efficient means of controlling them." That is why it is essential that the use and regulation of pesticides be governed by good judgment and dispassionate research. Again in the words of Dr. Shaw, "* * * pests cause losses in reduced yields and quality of crops and livestock of more than $10 billion each year. In addition, farmers spend more than $3 billion for cultural, mechanical, chemical, and biological methods of controlling pests."

The United States has the most comprehensive laws and enforcement procedures in the world for ensuring the effectiveness and safe use of agricultural chemicals, but it should be remembered that pesticides by and large have been the product of private enterprise. Overregulation can kill any private enterprise just as surely as a pest can kill a plant. Overregulation can be as dangerous to the future of our food supply as undercontrol, because pesticides and their proper use are the difference between abundance and scarcity.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, after their "liberation" by the Red army in those momentous days following World War II, the nations of Eastern Europe entered a long period of brutal oppression directed from the Kremlin. We correctly termed these once-proud nations "satellites."

Today there are encouraging signs that the Communist bloc has been fragmented and is now in a state of disarray. A struggle is underway to determine who will provide the orthodox line of Marxist-Leninist precepts. Eastern Europe is feeling effects from the dialog of dissent and we in the free world continue to hope that these states will regain the precious freedoms so long denied them.

The right to worship one's own God in his own way is a basic tenet of any free society. The peoples of Eastern Europe have been chafing under the conspicuous absence of this right. Communist leaders refuse to allow the national churches of Poland, Hungary and the Ukraine, to name but a few, to compete with their tired doctrines of dialectical materialism.

So, even as there is cause for cautious optimism for the future of the states of Eastern Europe, we must remain constantly aware of the many instances of tyranny which continue to oppress these proud peoples.

Captive Nations Week is an appropriate time for Members of the Congress to again articulate their great concern for the cause of political self-determination for the millions of people living behind the rusting Iron Curtain.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has set aside July 17 to July 23 for the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. It is a great personal privilege for me to be able to participate in an event concerned with the future of millions of our fellow human beings, now under Communist domination.

Already numerous measures calling for the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations have been introduced in this Congress. I hope my colleagues will vigorously support this effort, for the creation of such a committee would be living proof of our dedication to those liberties denied to captive peoples.

So long as other peoples are denied the right to vote, our own freedom is insecure. So long as nations are denied the right to self-determination we cannot have a truly peaceful world.

Soon after the nations of Eastern Europe achieved their independence after decades as vassals of the giant European empires, they were engulfed in a new form of imperialism, enforced by the Red army.

Despite more than 20 years of Communist rule the spirit of liberty and national independence lives on in the hearts of the peoples of Eastern Europe. Rioting and unrest continue to frustrate the plans of the Communist puppet regimes.

We in the United States have a strong stake in the future of these brave peoples. Our Nation has often been called a "melting pot" because it was built by men and women of many nationalities who came here to escape from tyranny and limited opportunity. The peoples of the captive nations are not simply the unfortunate victims of despotism in far-off lands. They are the broken families and relatives of many of our own citizens.

But as Americans we have another reason for supporting the cause of these brave people. Ours is a Nation founded on the principles of political liberty, national self-determination, and government through representative institutions. These ideals are part of the definition of our American nationality. We must continue to do all we can to promote the spread of freedom and representative institutions to all of the countries of the world.

For both these reasons, the peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the champion of their deepest aspirations. Although the United States was initially reluctant to abandon its traditional isolationist role, our record since the war in stemming Communist tyranny is commendable. Greece and Turkey remained stanch allies of the West while Austria and Finland retained their independence as neutrals. New challenges have been met in Berlin, Korea, and now Vietnam. But while we direct our attention to Communist aggression in one part of the world, we cannot turn our backs on Communist tyranny in another.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to do all we can to promote the growth of freedom and national independence in the captive nations. There are many signs that the Communist rulers are less and less able to impose their will on the gallant peoples still beholden to Communist imperialism.

New Kensington, Pa.: 75 Years of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, New Kensington, Pa., in my 21st District of Westmoreland County, has an historical heritage dating back to Kensington, England. This setting, which is just a few miles away from my childhood home on the Allegheny River at Johnetta, became an early center of activity for the Allegewi Indians along the trails and shores of the Big and Little Pucketos Creek forming the Allegheny.

This area rapidly developed as part of the star of the west and presents a history rich and important because of its strategic position as the gateway to the west. During the years of colonial life the location invited the stout in heart and stalwart in courage to come to the green hills and fertile valleys.

Industrial development began almost simultaneously with the incorporation of the town and this city became the home of the aluminium industry—the Aluminium Co. of America and the Wear-Ever Aluminum Co., Inc.—and gained a national reputation for business and manufacturing.

New Kensington rapidly became the hub for commerce, industry, and trade to become known as the Allegheny-Kiski Valley Leading Shopping Center.

This city is now celebrating its diamond jubilee to commemorate 75 years of progress. Along with the celebration of its past comes plans for educational, research, renewal, and industrial expansion for continued growth and development of the community.

I take this opportunity to offer tribute to the fine historical heritage of New Kensington and salute the community and its many fine citizens.

I also extend congratulations and success for the diamond jubilee celebration of July 21 and 31 and offer best wishes for the future.

It is communities such as this which have and will continue to make America great.

Shorten the Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to see that General Eisenhower in a recent magazine article has renewed the suggestions which he made after the presidential conventions in 1964 to regulate and control the quadrennial party nominating sessions. In an article in the July 6 Reader's Digest he rightly criticized the tumult and chaos of the conventions and their increasing lack of dignity. He stressed the fact that these are now internationally televised proceedings and carry a message for the whole world and that we must eliminate the tawdry and the cheap.

In my judgment, there were two faults in the General's article. In the first place he took too sober an attitude toward the legitimate controversial, funmaking, and combative aspects of the convention. In the second place, he failed to note the really objectionable point about current tendencies, the elimination of the delegate as a person of significance. In today's conventions, the delegates simply go along for the ride in equal or even subordinate rank with television technicians, youth demonstrators, and sundry visiting firemen.

General Eisenhower, unfortunately, fails to address himself to one other regretable aspect of our presidential campaigns which cries for reform and that is the inordinate length of these national canvasses.

Practically no other civilized country in the world subjects its citizens to the deluge of nonsense that accompanies a presidential campaign in the United States. At any rate, in other countries the electoral antics are limited to a period usually less than 30 days. In Canada and in England elections were recently held on a national scale and completed within such a period with complete satisfaction to all.

Why can we not do the same?

If any real purpose were being served by prolonging the agony, I would cheerfully remain quiet, but I have never seen a campaign where interest could be maintained at a constant pitch for more than a month. Beyond that all the money spent, the advertising bought, and the television preempted is just so much waste.

The long campaigns waste time, waste money, and waste the nervous energies of the candidates themselves. At the same time, the public becomes bored and apathetic and the informative purpose of a campaign is no longer served.

I sincerely hope that by the time the next campaign rolls around the American political parties will have seen fit to limit their elections to the reasonable space that adequately serves the other nations of the world. Otherwise I think that Congress should take action and pass bills such as H.R. 96 and House Joint Resolution 16 which I have introduced to establish reasonable controls.

How John Bright Outsmarted His Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the history of the American labor movement is one in which all Americans can take pride. I think that it is necessary to examine, now and then, exactly what it is that unions do for their members.

This was done recently in a short story published in the July 10, 1966, edition of the RWDSU Record published by the Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Union, AFL–CIO.

I commend this story to the attention of our colleagues:

HOW JOHN BRIGHT OUTSMARTED HIS UNION: A STORY WITH A MORAL

(By T. F. Cauldwell)

Once there was a fellow named John Bright. John worked in a small warehouse and was a member of the union—but not through choice. The shop was union when John started there, so he had to join; but he didn't have to like it.

The pay wasn't bad at the warehouse, and conditions in general were good. But there was a gripe John had that bothered him from the first day he took the job, and the bother grew and grew until it was all-consuming.

It began at the union office when the local president told John about conditions on the job, like "fringe benefits" and such.

"You and your family are covered for hospitalization, surgery, sick benefits," said the local president. "Then there's life insurance and a pension too, if you stick it out till you're 65."

John was not named Bright for nothing. "And what will this cost me?" he asked.

"Not a cent," said the union president. "The company pays into the Health Fund and the Pension Fund, to the tune of $107.38 a month, for these benefits. I guess you could say this is your money, since it would go to you in cash if we didn't have these benefits, but * * * obviously it's better this way."

John didn't think so. He walked away from the union office mentally dividing $107.38 into hourly pay, and his resentment grew as the arithmetic was worked out.

It happened also that John at this very moment was suffering from a financial virus known as the "shorts."

"Hell," said John, "this fringe stuff will cost me 62 cents an hour—*my money* which they are horsing around with * * * *My money*, and they—the union—decides how I should spend it."

John Bright was not only a mathematical whiz, he was also a gifted orator. At the meetings of the Knights of Pichicarus, no one ever had the last word over John, and while some soreheads attributed a falling-off in attendance to this fact, John denounced this rumor as a vicous canard. At any rate, John was not the kind of guy to keep a big gripe like this to himself, and so after a brief period of acclimation to the job and the six other men in the warehouse, he brought up the subject at lunch.

"We get 62 cents an hour swiped from our pay every week," John said, for openers.

"How come?" asked one of the men.

"Because they (pointing in the direction of the union office) decide what fringe benefits we get," John said. "Seems to me we could decide for ourselves. With 62 cents an hour more in our jeans, we could do a lot of fringe benefitting on our own."

John was nothing if not persuasive. Came contract time, John had all but one of the men on his side, and despite all the arguments of the union officers, the shop voted 6 to 1 to convert fringes to cold cash. And it was so ordered.

John went home that evening a very happy man.

"Give that chuck roast to the dog," he told his wife. "We're eating steak. I got over a hundred dollars a month raise today on top of five bucks a week the union negotiated. And for the hundred bucks you can thank little Johnny Bright, 'cause it was me that got it, all by myself."

His wife was impressed, and being Bright also, was doubly impressed when he told her how the extra raise was maneuvered.

"Certainly it was smart!" she said. "What benefits can they give you that will be worth $107.38 a month? You outfoxed them, Johnny, and I'm proud of you!"

So the next morning, with a light heart and a head to match, John got in his car and started to work. When he arrived, there was a note for him to call his wife.

"John," his wife said when he called, "Junior stuck a pea up his nose and it has worked its way into his head. He's in the hospital."

"In the hospital!" John gasped.

"Well, he's just like you," his wife said. "He's got a brain the size of a pea and the doctor says they've got to be real careful that they don't make a mistake and remove the brain instead of the pea. It's going to cost us $48 a day for the hospital, and the doctor wants $150 for himself."

"Forty-eight dollars a day! A hundred and fifty bucks!" John gasped again. "Well, thank the Lord I've got hospitalization and surgical coverage!"

"But have you?"

With that John raced down to the union office.

"My boy's in the hospital with a pea in his head," he told the union president. "You haven't cut off my hospitalization and surgical coverage, have you?"

"I had to, John," the president sighed. "It's a benefit, and we have to pay into the fund for anyone covered. You wanted the money instead * * * remember, that 62 cents an hour?"

"But I couldn't keep the dog at the vet for that kind of money," said John. "I need hospitalization, and surgical, and I'll buy it myself, for the family."

"It'll cost you maybe three times as much," the officer said. "We buy at a group rate, like wholesale."

"I ought to be shot!" John said.

"You can't afford it!" the union man replied. "Your life insurance is cut off too. That's another fringe benefit. But of course, you have the 62 cents an hour."

John thought a moment, and asked, "How much will it cost me to get the same amount of insurance?"

"Maybe four times as much. We get that wholesale too."

John looked like he was going to cry. "I think I'll just retire!" he whimpered.

"You can't do that, either," said the president.

"Your pension has been cut off, and to get an annuity that would match your pension would cost you over 10 percent of your salary per month."

"Well, I know what I *can* do!" John said grimly. "I can punch you right in the mouth. You let me talk the other fellows into pulling out of the fringe benefits plan. You let me make a fool of myself!"

With that, John hauled off and took a swing at the union president. The president ducked and John's fist went through the window.

"Well, don't just stand there," John snarled, staring down at his bleeding knuckles. "Get me a doctor for this hand!"

The president sighed. "I think you should be told first that the doctor's fee will have to be paid by you personally. You know that you're no longer covered for treatment."

John looked at his hand, and then at the union officer.

"Can I make a suggestion?" he asked.

"Sure, as long as you don't expect a suggestion award. What is it?

"All I want to suggest," said John, "is this: take back the $107.38 a month. Take back the lousy money and give me back my benefits."

"Gladly," said the president. "We know you're one man who will really appreciate them."

Safer Autos and Drivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. RONAN

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that making automobiles safer is in the public interest.

The Chicago Sun Times affirms that truth in an editorial discussing the safety bill passed by the Senate and legislation under consideration in the House.

Congress is doing its part to make autos safer, the Times says. And now the States and cities must apply themselves to accident prevention by enforcing traffic laws and improving the standards of driving and road construction.

Since all phases of highway safety are of intense concern, I ask that the editorial be made a part of the Record.

[From the Chicago Sun Times, June 29, 1966]

SAFER AUTOS—AND DRIVERS

The Senate has passed an auto safety bill for U.S. and foreign cars, trucks, buses and motor scooters that is somewhat more stringent than had been anticipated. The bill calls for certain interim safety measures to be built into this year's new models and full compliance with 26 new safety standards in 1968 models. Further safety standards will be explored and if found necessary, adopted. The House Commerce Committee has a similar bill under consideration.

There is no doubt that making autos safer is in the public interest. The added safety features are not aimed primarily at eliminating the number of auto accidents, although some of the requirements, such as higher standards for tires and larger windshield wipers, to improve visibility, should help lower the accident toll. The new federal regulations are drawn chiefly to reduce the severity of injuries caused by the "second collision," the ricocheting of the driver and passengers within the auto as a result of a collision. Toward that objective, the Senate has ordered that all knobs and projections inside the auto be recessed or padded to protect the occupants.

Other strong measures are needed if the number of accidents is to be reduced. The National Safety Council says that driver error is a factor in 90 per cent of auto accidents. The two main offenses are speeding too fast for conditions and failure to yield the right of way.

Congress is doing its part to make autos safer. The individual states and communities must now do their part in applying themselves to the larger problem, that of accident prevention. A start can be made on that problem by the strict enforcement of intelligently drawn traffic laws, the realization that licensing a person to drive an auto is a grave responsibility and not just a revenue-producing or bookkeeping chore, and by the safe engineering of roads and streets.

South-West Africa Verdict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, many of us are deeply distressed about the decision of the World Court in the South-West Africa cases and the implications of the decision. As I indicated on this floor yesterday, I consider the Court's action a "tragedy" and noted that, in my judgment, the decision was based on "technical legal reasons of dubious validity."

The New York Times lead editorial today reflects the same judgment and concern and I commend it to my colleagues and to other readers of the Record:

SOUTH-WEST AFRICA VERDICT

The decision of the International Court of Justice to throw out the South-West African case will baffle laymen and arouse fierce debate among international lawyers.

It is bound to affect the stature and usefulness of the World Court. It will necessarily alter the means employed by African governments, in the U.N. and elsewhere, to press the fight against white domination and racial segregation in southern Africa.

One reason why the decision will provoke enduring argument among lawyers is the remarkable seven-to-seven deadlock of the justices on so important a case. This required the vote of the Court's President, Sir Percy Spender of Australia, to produce a verdict, which in effect reversed a previous verdict of the same Court on the same case.

Another reason is the devastating nature of some of the dissents, particularly that of the American justice, Philip C. Jessup, who said the judgment was "completely unfounded in law."

The question about the ruling that both lawyers and laymen find most puzzling is this: Why did the Court take jurisdiction in the case if Ethiopia and Liberia could not establish "any legal right or interest in the subject matter of their claims" against South Africa? As Justice Jessup posed it in his dissent:

"Why would the Court tolerate a situation in which the parties would be put to great trouble and expense to explore all the details of the merits, and only thereafter be told that the Court would pay no heed to all their arguments and evidence because the case was dismissed on a preliminary ground which precluded any investigation of the merits?"

The answers can only be: Because the Court line-up had changed—due to death, illness and disqualification—between the acceptance of jurisdiction in 1962 and the verdict of 1966. And because this Court majority (given the President's votes) drew a fine, legalistic line between the right to jurisdiction and the right to a decision on the merits of the complaints of the two plaintiffs.

Prior to deciding not to rule on the merits, Sir Percy and his colleagues probed deeply into the claims of the plaintiffs. In the most protracted case it has ever heard, the Court studied sixteen printed volumes of written pleadings and listened to nearly 6,000 pages of oral argument in 112 sessions.

After all this, the majority declined to rule even on whether the League of Nations mandate for South-West Africa, conferred on South Africa in 1920, is still in force. And it evaded the question of whether extension of racial segregation (apartheid) into South-West Africa violates South Africa's mandate obligation to "promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress" of the 526,000 inhabitants, all but 75,000 of them nonwhite.

This verdict will disappoint all who had hoped for a valuable addition to the body of international law. On the South-West African question it represents retrogression of a sort, for in an advisory opinion in 1950 the Court had held that South Africa was still bound by the mandate and that the U.N. had inherited the League's supervisory functions.

For South Africa, the decision is a victory beyond the fondest hopes of Prime Minister Verwoerd. The verdict means that for the foreseeable future South Africa can continue to administer South-West Africa, including the extension of apartheid, unhindered by international supervision or interference.

With the legal route to change in South-West Africa and an international legal judgment on apartheid barred indefinitely, the new African nations will not turn to other channels. Moderate African voices will have vastly greater difficulty gaining a hearing; the language of the African majority in the U.N. or the Organization of American Unity will become more strident and its actions more violent.

It will be a long time before the United States or anyone else will be able to persuade any African government that it can obtain justice from the International Court of Justice.

The Continuing Water Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the gravity of the water crisis throughout our Nation is of deep concern to me. The crisis cannot be permitted to continue if we are to remain a strong, growing Nation. Uncontaminated water is necessary for survival. Our polluted water resources and declining water supply can only be attributed to many years of neglect, both public and private. This neglect must be ended at once.

I insert in the Record the following editorial comment on this subject from the Chicago Daily News of July 16, 1966:

POLLUTION'S HIGH COST

The bill unanimously passed by the Senate for a massive cleanup of the nation's water resources emphasizes the immensity of the problem, in size and cost. Going far beyond President Johnson's recommendations, the Senate has authorized spending

$6.2 billion in federal funds over the next six years—with an additional $13.8 billion to be contributed by states, local governments and industries.

As many experts see it, this proposed $20 billion outlay is only the beginning of a program that ultimately may cost as much as $100 billion. As shocking as the price tag may be, it is no more so than the years of public and private neglect, ignorance and indifference that brought America's rivers, lakes and other water resources to their present state of contamination.

The time is past due to start paying for these old mistakes. There is, unhappily, no bargain-basement approach to the problem. The longer its solution is put off, the higher the cost will be in dollars and in public health and dwindling recreational facilities.

If there is a lesson to be learned from all this, it is that the pollution or devastation of our natural resources is cheaper to prevent than to remedy. The lesson applies to other resources besides water.

Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, we have completed another poll of public opinion in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania. The district embraces most of Allegheny County north of the city of Pittsburg. It is basically residential and industrial, and contains a large variety of ethnic groups. The district also varies from wealthy areas to economically distressed areas, but at present unemployment there is low.

The total number of citizens replying to the questionnaire was gratifyingly large, and probably sufficient to represent a referendum on each issue. The tabulated results with some observations are included below. I sincerely hope many will find them interesting and informative.

TABULATED RESULTS FOR POLL CONDUCTED JUNE 1966

1. What should we do about Vietnam? (Please select only one.)

(a) Continue our present course, 8%.

(b) Mount an all-out effort (not including nuclear or chemical weapons) for a military victory, 55%.

(c) Hold key defensible positions and try to negotiate a settlement, 19%.

(d) Withdraw as soon as possible, 18%.

Practically all your replies were received before the U.S. bombing of oil depots in North Vietnam, so it is evident that most of our people favored the decision to do so before it was made. In our February poll 81% of our respondents agreed that we were doing the right thing in fighting to preserve the independence of South Vietnam.

2. Which do you think would be the one best step to fight inflation and the rising cost of living?

(a) Increase personal and corporate income taxes, 4%.

(b) Reduce domestic Federal spending, 77%.

(c) Impose Federal wage, price, and credit control, 19%.

Our people realize that inflation is the cruelest tax of all and they clearly feel that the best way to fight it is to cut the amount of Federal domestic spending which is already seriously eroding the value of our dollar. However, spending Federal revenues for pet projects continues to be so popular with the voters that reducing the bulging budget is not as easy as it would appear In the February poll 81% indicated that they expected a 10% increase in inflation within 2 years.

3. Do you think the "War on Poverty" has been worth the cost? Yes, 12%; No, 88%.

There can be little doubt that, regardless of the ideals embodied in the "War on Poverty," the agency in charge has done a poor job and that the chief beneficiaries of this big, money spending project have been the officials selected to administer the programs instead of the needy.

4. Would you vote for substantial cuts in our foreign aid program? Yes, 87%; No, 13%.

For many years our people have been voicing increasing disenchantment with our foreign aid expenditures. It is interesting to note that in February of this year 85% answered Yes when we asked the limited question, 'Should the U.S. withhold foreign aid from nations that do not generally support our foreign policies?" 15% answered No.

5. Do you favor the crash program to be the first nation to land a man on the moon? Yes, 38%; No, 62%.

Our race with Russia to be the first nation to land a man on the moon is primarily a matter of pride and prestige. Our current crash program is costing many millions of dollars and demands the time and skills of hundreds of scientists and technicians that could be saved if we were to proceed at a more measured pace. In fact, many believe that a joint effort by all nations capable of helping would be good and that we should try to bring about such a cooperative effort.

6. Do you favor the proposal that all American youths be drafted for two years of Federal military or civilian service? Yes, 66%; No, 34%.

Several years ago our respondents voted definitely in favor of universal military training, so the results here are not surprising. There is also a general feeling that the present draft regulations result in too many injustices. This was illustrated in our February poll when 79% said that they thought the draft regulations exempted too many young men on physical, mental, and educational grounds.

7. Do you favor Federal standards for packaging and labeling of consumer products? Yes, 86%; No, 14%.

This is the first time that we have included a question on this subject, and the results here suggest that the great majority of consumers feel confused or deceived by the multiplicity of sizes and weights that are displayed on the shelves or are advertised. Although standardization of packaging and labeling will put some companies to considerable expense, it is likely that action in this direction will be made by the Congress.

8. Would you vote to permit political contributions of up to $100 to be allowable income tax deductions? Yes, 45%; No, 55%.

The results on this question were the closest on the poll and do not reflect a clear cut pro or con decision. With the terrific increase in the cost of political campaigns something must be done to help candidates financially, or only the rich will be able to run for important offices. Perhaps if President Johnson had asked for an allowable deduction of less than $100 (say, $50) more would support the proposal.

9. Would you favor uniform traffic regulations, automobile safety devices, and driver's license requirements throughout our fifty states? Yes, 89%; No, 11%.

The variety of speed laws, drivers' qualifications, automobile inspection regulations, traffic signs, road markings, etc. that exist in our several states have resulted in much bewilderment to drivers and have probably caused some accidents. Uniformity of all such items should have been established long ago.

10. Do you believe that the Administration releases enough accurate information to keep the press and the public adequately informed on the actual state of the nation? Yes, 23%; No, 77%.

The Administration has not kept the press and the public adequately and accurately informed on what is going on regarding the policies of our country. While certain information must be classified and kept secret, this power has been abused. In fact, the phrase, "Credibility Gap," is very commonly heard and its existence is too often true.

11. Do you feel that the Executive and Judiciary have encroached too much in the field of legislation: Yes, 82%; No, 18%.

There results here indicate that the public is as aware as the Congress that the Executive and the Judicial branches of the government have so encroached on the powers of the Legislative that the balance of power between the three branches should be restored. The trouble here can be partly traced to the present ineffectiveness of the two party system.

12. How would you rate President Johnson's over-all performance in office to date? (a) good, 12%; (b) fair, 48%; (c) poor, 40%.

Here we have three sets of figures available for comparison. In June 1965 the responses indicated Johnson's performance good, 28%; fair, 58%; and bad, 14%. In February 1966 the rating was good, 22%; fair, 54%; and bad, 24%. In the current question we used the word "poor" instead of "bad," but even this milder definition does not detract much from the conclusion that the President's standing with the people has gone down fast.

Max Newman, 89, Veterans Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Max Newman has died at a young 89. Although a veteran of the Spanish-American War and one of the active members of the United Spanish-American War Veterans, he still found time for government and politics and was one of my most helpful constituents.

Although few of his contemporaries survive, all who knew him will mourn.

His New York Times obituary follows, but it cannot possibly cover the little personal items which meant so much to those who had the good fortune to know him.

[From the New York Times, July 20, 1966]

MAX NEWMAN, 89, VETERANS' LEADER

Max Newman of 320 East 42d Street, New York County commander of the United Spanish-American War Veterans for 10 years, died Monday night in the Veterans Administration Hospital in Manhattan. His age was 89.

Mr. Newman was to have been grand marshal of the Memorial Day parade here this year, but could not serve because of illness. He had officiated as marshal of two earlier parades.

Until he became ill several months ago, he went to the veterans' quarters in City Hall every day. There, he handled welfare and other affairs for his organization and helped veterans in need of aid.

Mr. Newman was a retired real-estate broker. He was born in New York and enlisted in May, 1898, in Company G, Eighth Regiment, New York Infantry. He was discharged for a physical disability almost four months later.

Project Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, among the unsung heroes of the tragic conflict in Vietnam are the American physicians who have voluntarily faced hardship and danger to minister to the civilian victims of war. In the noblest tradition of their profession, these physicians have selflessly subordinated their own interests to the needs of suffering humanity.

One hundred and nineteen physicians have served in this most valuable Project Vietnam since it started in August 1965. At present 32 are on duty there with 192 scheduled to go during this fiscal year.

A distinguished member of the profession, Dr. S. William Kalb, of Newark, N.J., has written a most interesting account of his recent tour of duty. The article appeared in the Clara Maass Hospital News, Bellville, N.J., April 1966. The spirit that animated Dr. Kalb and his fellow physicians is exemplified in his concluding remarks:

> It was quite a rewarding experience. Would I do it all over again? You bet!

The article follows in full:

PROJECT VIETNAM

(By S. William Kalb, M.D.)

Where in the world but in Viet Nam can you be a real doctor once again? All the dreams you had as a little boy . . . all the ideals that possessed you in high school . . . all the hopes and aspirations you had in college were realized on the other side of the world.

No worries about an office, your help, making money for your family, hospital committees, malpractice, and a hundred other things you are concerned about in daily practice at home.

I was sent to a small town about 50 miles south of Saigon in the Mekong Delta. There I was to do general practice. I was the only medical man in a 400-bed hospital consisting of thirteen one-story buildings. Sanitation was something you talked about, but was not a reality.

Forty iron beds in every ward with boards for mattresses. Two or three patients in every bed. One would find a diabetic, a typhoid, and a cholera patient all in one bed. If a mother had an amputation or some other wound or sickness, the husband and all the children moved in. Some of the family sleeping with the patient and the rest of them under the bed. The hospital fed the whole family. A forty-bed ward might easily have a hundred people living there. Lizards crawling all over the cracked walls and ceilings. These helped to reduce the census of flies, mosquitoes, and ants.

In the clinic I saw about 300 to 350 patients a day . . . malaria, cholera, tuberculosis, pneumonia, leprosy, dysentery, plague, smallpox, tetanus, nutritional diseases, skin lesions, and many tropical diseases.

In the emergency room I helped out with the casualties that even to doctors are too horrible to describe.

I was on call for maternity emergencies, such as placenta praevia, dystocia, ruptured uteri, and prolonged labors.

During my last three weeks in Viet Nam I worked in a bomb shelter dispensary in a nearby village where I had to do all the medical and surgical emergencies. Every afternoon I spent five hours in jungle villages, twenty of them, to treat Vietnamese and Viet Cong families. Here I inoculated over 3,000 children against smallpox, typhoid-paratyphoid, cholera, and tetanus.

It was quite a rewarding experience. Would I do it allover again? You bet!

Youth Opportunity Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, recently in San Antonio in my home district a unique program was inaugurated with the first youth oportunity fair which gave the young people of my district the chance to see in an organized fashion just what educational and job prospects there are in their home area.

Many fine San Antonio leaders worked in this fair and spent a great deal of time and effort in planning it. I would like to share with you the report I have received on this fine project from Mr. Ray Broussard, an employee of the Texas State Department of Welfare, who served as public relations chairman for the fair. Mr. Broussard's report follows:

YOUTH OPPORTUNITY FAIR—SAN ANTONIO RESPONDS

On May 31st and June 1st, 1966, the first annual Youth Opportunity Fair was held at the Villita Assembly Hall in San Antonio, Texas. What the Youth Opportunity Advisory Council envisioned as an "idea" some fourth months prior to the Fair, developed into an unbelievable reality during the two days the function was held.

The Youth Opportunity Fair was the brain child of the Youth Opportunity Center's Advisory Council appointed on January 11, 1966. For four months a number of civic-minded individuals worked with the community of San Antonio, other cities and agencies in Texas and representatives in Washington, in order to make the Fair a "giant" career day which would make possible the distribution of educational and occupational information to school drop-outs, high school students, high school graduates and college students—this was done on a mammoth scale.

The magnitude of Youth Opportunity Fair can be envisioned only by making a comparison between the Fair and a regular school career day.

Consider for a moment, the floor space of a large high school gym completely occupied by exhibits depicting the educational and occupational opportunities of some fifteen or twenty industrial, governmental, religious and educational organizations. Manning these exhibits are professional individuals who furnish educational and occupational information requested by the students in attendance.

During the aforementioned career day the school would be offering the student body information on selected and limited educational and occupational areas—that is, the school would not offer information in all phases of education and the world of work. And, moreover, the school drop-out would not be reached.

In considering the Youth Opportunity Fair of 1966, however, one would have found not fifteen exhibits, not twenty exhibits, but some eighty-five exhibits occupying the first and second levels of the Villita Assembly Hall in San Antonio, Texas.

Imagine—under one roof—the following exhibitors offering information, free of charge, on educational and occupational opportunities in San Antonio, in the state of Texas and at the national level:

EXHIBITORS

Business, industry, and labor

Friedrich Refrigerator, Inc., Southwest Research Institute, Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co., Texas Hotel and Motel Assn., AFL–CIO, Columbia Industries, Inc., Wall Colmonoy Corporation, Coca-Cola Bottling Co., Urban Renewal Corporation, United Services Automobile Assn.

Government

San Antonio Air Material Area, Kelly AFB; Brooke Army Medical Center, National Aeronautics and Space Admin., U.S. Army Medical Training Center, State Dept. of Public Welfare, City of San Antonio, Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio River Authority.

U.S. Army Recruiting Station, U.S. Navy Recruiting Station, U.S. Marines Recruiting Station, U.S. Air Force Recruiting Station, U.S. Coast Guard Recruiting Station, U.S. Civil Service Commission, City Public Service Board, Youth Opportunity Center, Office of Economic Opportunity, Bureau of Apprenticeship & Training, Health Careers Committee, San Antonio Chamber of Commerce; Office, Congressman HENRY B. GONZALEZ.

Educational and training institutions

San Antonio College, St. Philip's College, Gary Job Corps Training Center, Women's Job Corps (WICS), SANYO, San Antonio Commercial College, Durhams Business College, Community College (Business), St. Mary's University, Edgewood High School, Lanier High School, Our Lady of the Lake College, March of Dimes.

Religious

San Antonio Council of Churches, Catholic Chancery, Temple Beth-El, Baptist Missions.

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES WHO ASPIRE COLLEGE ATTENDANCE

Imagine the impact made by the National Aeronautics Space Administration exhibit covering some 750 square feet of floor space and the information distributed on the infinite opportunities in the field of space technology for the college graduates and skilled technicians.

Consider as well the value of the information given by St. Mary's University. Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio College and St. Philip's College on college attendance and information on how and where to obtain scholarships and loans in order to attend college. The values brought about by the Youth Opportunity Fair in these areas are immeasurable.

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

The high school students were amazed and spellbound by the occupational opportunities depicted by the exhibits of the City of San Antonio, City Public Service Board, Urban Renewal Agency, Durham and Community Business Colleges, Kelly Air Force Base, Brooke Medical Center, Santa Rosa Medical District, State Department of Public Welfare, all armed services and many more.

If this exposure on such a gigantic level did not encourage students in attendance to stay in school, nothing will keep them from dropping out of school.

SCHOOL DROP-OUTS

The school drop-out was not only exposed to exhibits mentioned heretofore, but also to a multitude of exhibits directly related to opportunities available for the drop-out.

The Camp Gary Job Corps had twenty-nine exhibits depicting opportunities available to the drop-out. Edgewood and Lanier high schools had exhibits and their personnel encouraged the drop-out to return to school. The Youth Opportunity Center in San Antonio had its staff available in order to counsel with the drop-out and encouraged him to visit the center at a later date for further counseling, testing, possible placement, retraining, or referral to some work-study program.

It is only appropriate to conclude with the knowledge that the Youth Opportunity Fair was a tremendous success and that some 8,000 youths attended the Fair—they came, they were interested, they were informed about the vast opportunities available to them and they left at the conclusion of the Fair with a brighter outlook on life and the future in store for them.

The Youth Opportunity Advisory Council should be commended for taking the lead by initiating a yearly program which is geared under the President's national Youth Opportunity Program.

Gerald Taniguchi of Hawaii Relates Peace Corps Experiences in Sarawak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming success of America's Peace Corps is due largely to the outstanding men and women who have volunteered for service in the Corps. The dedication with which they have upheld its highest ideals is truly inspirational. An example of this excellence in our volunteers is Mr. Gerald Taniguchi, of Honolulu, Hawaii.

Mr. Taniguchi served 2 years as a teacher in distant Sarawak. His experience has not only enriched his personal life but it has brought to the people of Hawaii an intimate knowledge of a heretofore little-heard-of country in southeast Asia. Presently a student at the University of Hawaii, he hopes to return to Sarawak when he completes his studies.

The fascinating account of Mr. Taniguchi's commendable work in southeast Asia was related to Honolulu Advertiser Reporter Jane Evinger. I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the newspaper article which appeared in the Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser, July 10, 1966.

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Star-Bulletin & Advertiser, July 10, 1966]

PEACE CORPS ADVENTURE IN SARAWAK

(By Jane Evinger)

Gerald Taniguchi, at 22 a veteran of two years as a Peace Corps volunteer in Sarawak, gives the impression of being quietly self-sufficient.

Poised and relaxed, he pauses for a moment at times, trying to find exactly the right words to describe his experiences. When the answers come, they reflect this thoughtfulness, and are spoken in a pleasant, clear voice.

There's also a quality of reticence in the Kauai-born volunteer.

He's obviously not a young man who blows his own horn, and an interviewer gets the impression that if Gerald hadn't been asked pointblank "what did you do on your vacation in Sarawak?" the most impressive act of his stint there would never have been mentioned.

What Gerald did on his vacation was take four students from his remote village on their first trip to another country.

He paid for the trip, which cost the equivalent of $650, with money he'd saved during the past year out of his $70 monthly Peace Corps living allowance.

And he passed up the opportunity to vacation alone in Hong Kong and Singapore, neither of which he'd ever seen, in order to take the kids on a holiday.

"We had an essay contest at school on 'Why I Want to Go to Sabah' and I took the boys who wrote the four best ones," Gerald said. Sabah borders Sarawak, on the island of Borneo.

"The kids had never been out of the jungle or their town, and this was the first time any of them had ever flown or ridden boats and trains."

Staying sometimes in hotels and sometimes with other Peace Corps people, they traveled for three weeks, making their first visit to Sarawak's own capital of Kuching, as well as to another country.

"They were really good kids, who had never been out, and I wanted to see the country but not go alone," Taniguchi says simply.

He spent the last three weeks of his vacation living with a student and his family in one of the "long houses," Sarawak's common structures housing 50 or so families.

"I wanted to see how they lived," Taniguchi said. Among other things, he learned how to tap rubber during the stay with the family.

Gerald grew up on Kauai but moved to Hilo with his parents when he was 15.

He is a 1961 graduate of Hilo High. His father, Masao Taniguchi, is a parts manager for an automotive warehouse in Honolulu and his mother, Mrs. Toyono Taniguchi, formerly a waitress in Hilo, lives in Eleele, Kauai. An older brother is a dentist on the Mainland.

Gerald had two years at the University of Washington as an engineering student, then volunteered for the Peace Corps.

Asked why, he muses "that's a hard question—I never really could find an answer."

Part of it was his indecision over whether to become a teacher or an engineer. Part of it was that "I did want to work as a volunteer, and in a way I felt that if I had something to offer that the Peace Corps could use, it would be a way of serving."

He trained for 10 weeks in Hilo and arrived in Sarawak on Jan. 4, 1964.

From the capital, it was a 19-hour trip by river launch to Saratok government secondary school, where Gerald spent his first year in Sarawak.

His second year was at another government school near Binatang, a town of about 600 people, "about twice the size of Saratok," he said. "The towns aren't very big because only the Chinese live in them. The natives live out of town in the long houses."

Living conditions were not bad he recalls. "I lived in a teacher's house with several native teachers at each school, and we had electricity and piped water."

Diet was another story. Gerald lost 30 pounds during his two years in Sarawak, due mainly to lack of protein.

"I ate at the school, and at every meal we'd get a big plate of rice, a bowl of vegetables, and a third dish. Sometimes this was salted fish or peanuts or what they call 100-year-old eggs. I never could eat them, although I tasted one—they were too salty," Gerald said.

Pork was forbidden at the school because the country is Moslem, and beef was unobtainable.

At the school, Gerald taught math six hours a day to 240 students.

He also organized sports and coached basketball, organized a "sort of world affairs council discusion group of students," and worked with the students after school and week-ends building fishponds for tilapia "farms" to supplement the usual diet in Sarawak.

"It was kind of hard to get the natives motivated to work, but I found that they would work if I worked with them," he explained.

Most of his students had had no contact with anything beyond the village, and were the first generation in their families to receive an education.

"I feel they are the best students I've ever seen in their behavior, manners, respect for elders and motivation to study," Gerald said. "I enjoyed teaching them and I still get letters from them."

In free moments, he wrote a freshman high school math text.

"They needed one adapted to Sarawak. Instead of problems dealing with flying from London to somewhere in Europe, they needed ones about flying from Kuching. Instead of pounds and pence, the problems should deal with the Malaysian dollar."

Gerald said he suffered no "cultural shock" when he first arrived in Sarawak, but "after I'd been there nine months I got into a state of depression, asking myself why, what was I doing there."

It lasted about a month, but then came the trip with four students, which snapped him out of it. "I enjoyed the start of my tour as a volunteer, and I enjoyed being there the second year even more after the bout of depression," he recalls.

Gerald feels that anything he accomplished in Sarawak "is not something you can see right now—it's getting students to learn by themselves, in some ways breaking through the tradition of learning by rote."

He extended his tour by three months in order to finish up the Sarawak school year, which ends in mid-December. He spent three weeks traveling to Singapore and Japan, and arrived in Honolulu last January.

Gerald now lives in a neat, spotless ground-floor apartment, entered through the garage, at 2026 Linohau Way.

It is decorated with farewell gifts given to him by his students. A gorgeous cotton print hangs on the wall, along with several decorative hats. There also are a carved, painted walking stick, an ancient head hunter's dagger, and intricately woven baskets.

"They're nice, good people, Southeast Asians," Gerald says.

From his Peace Corps experience, he feels he has gained in "understanding very poor people—that there are different kinds of people—and the way they think."

His experience in Sarawak also answered the question of whether he should become a teacher or an engineer.

Gerald entered the University of Hawaii last January, planning to become a high school math teacher. He also works 11 hours a week in a tutoring program designed to help prepare students from low income families for college.

After graduation, he would like to go back to Sarawak to teach for a few years—and write sequels to the freshman math text.

Eventually, he hopes to go into school administration in the Islands "unless I find teaching too interesting."

As the interview concluded, Gerald asked if he could say one thing further. It was this:

"I'd like to see more people from Hawaii go into the Peace Corps if they can. It's a good opportunity for college graduates, and I think the Orientals will find hardly any problem adapting to the culture in Southeast Asia.

"The white man is considered superior there, and the people can't accept him as a companion, but they can the Oriental volunteers."

Operation Combat Leave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, while much of the Nation is presently crippled by the airline strike, I wonder if my colleagues have stopped to wonder how our Vietnam veterans on leave have been getting home. Travis Air Force Base in the Fourth District, the major point of embarkation for troops flying to and from Vietnam, has taken imaginative steps to enable combat returnees to enjoy their well-deserved leave with their families.

For the great success of Operation Combat Leave, I salute Brig. Gen. Maurice F. Casey, of the 60th Military Air Lift Wing. Following is a release I received today from Travis Air Force Base explaining Operation Combat Leave:

A task force for the emergency conversion of Travis Air Force Base terminal facilities to speed the air lift of combat returnees held up by the air lines strike has been put in operation by Brig. Gen. Maurice F. Casey of the 60th Military Air Lift Wing.

The task force is composed of engineering operations, Red Cross facilities, and Chaplain service representatives. It was placed on a crash schedule during the weekend with two main objectives:

(1) Reorganization of the terminal to expedite the handling and air lift of combat returnees seeking to reach home areas.

(2) Full utilization of every available resource to assist the returnees.

"Travis intends to do its full share to take care of these personnel for the duration of the strike," General Casey said. "We are making Herculean efforts—including removal of walls in the terminal to make better accommodations for them."

"Since the air lines strike began we have mover over 5,000 passengers on state-side routes set up as an interim measure, and we have already moved 50,000 passengers this month on regular military air lift command routes. At this rate we will shatter our previous record for passenger air lifts to all parts of the world."

He praised the manner in which Travis personnel, many off-duty for the weekend, answered the emergency call to create a new state-side travel area in the North Wing of the terminal. Officers throughout the Wing were quickly evacuated, equipment removed and partitions torn out to make space for a Personnel Center and auxiliary wing lounge for the steady influx of Army, Navy, and Air Force returnees seeking in-land flights.

Approximately 1,300 servicemen, plus a sprinkling of dependents who landed at Travis with them, were placed aboard Air Reserve National Guard and military air lift command planes for "Operation Combat-Leave" flights. An additional 715 returnees were flown from Travis Monday.

The Combat Leave flights are being coordinated along five major coast-to-coast routes by reserve officers assigned here by Continental Air Command Headquarters from the 6th Air Force Reserve Region, Hamilton Air Force Base, California.

Hastily relocated by the terminal conversion were Army, Navy and Air Force Liaison and Traffic Coordinating Officers and officers of the Army Terminal and Logistics Processing Branch at Oakland, California. Returnees arriving here overseas new are advised to check with the E & J Travel Office at the terminal and proceed directly to the new state-side clearing center if they cannot make connections to their mainland destinations.

On reporting to the clearing center, they consult a flight schedule and indicate a choice of flights on a card along with their name and home destinations. Cross country routes and pickup points are Travis to McGuire AFB, via Richards-Gebaur, AFB, Missouri and Wright Patterson AFB, Ohio; Travis to Langley AFB, Virginia, via Tinker AFB, Oklahoma and Sewart AFB, Tennessee; Travis to Charleston AFB, South Carolina via Kelly AFB, Texas and Maxwell AFB, Alabama, and Travis to Hunter AFB, Georgia via Biggs AFS, Texas and New Orleans Naval Station, Louisiana.

Lt. Col. Orville D. Beardsley, Travis Passenger Services Office, declared that most of the combat returnees are able to make flight connections from Travis within 24 hours and all but a few are able to get flights within 48 hours.

Spokesman for the travel service office estimated that bus travel from the terminal has tripled since start of the strike and space on commercial airlines from the Bay Area is slightly easier than during the first days of the strike. They described military half-fare travel as a victim of the strike, because of existing backlog of full-fare passengers.

Greyhound Bus officials have agreed to provide express service to major cities for groups of 32 or more but only a few such trips have been made thus far.

Outstanding Legislative Assistant: Terry Segal's 24th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this distinguished body to the 24th birthday of my outstanding legislative assistant, Terry Philip Segal.

Terry Segal, a graduate of Amherst College and now a third-year student at Yale Law School, has been with me for four summers.

Mr. Speaker, Terry Segal is an invaluable addition to my office—keeping me informed on key legislative developments, handling press relations, and supervising my summer intern program.

It is truly a pleasure and comfort to me to have such an outstanding person as Terry Segal on my staff; I wish him many more happy birthdays.

Business Is Exciting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly enlightened businessmen in the city of Los Angeles is Eddy S. Feldman. A considerable amount of his time is devoted to civic and cultural activities in our community, and because of his progressive views he is greatly in demand as a public speaker. His recent speech before the Downtown Business Men's Association offers a challenge to American business that deserves broad attention. I am pleased, therefore, to insert it in the RECORD for the edification of my colleagues:

BUSINESS IS EXCITING
(By Eddie S. Feldman)

Mr. Beardsley Ruml, one time head of Macy's department store, wrote that:

"Business is one of the most pervasive facts of modern life. Practically everybody who lives in a city, town, or village does business with business several times a day, and practically everybody else has something to do with business many, many times in every year. We depend on business for the things that we eat and wear, for the home we live in, for most of our amusements and recreation, for going places and knowing what is going on in the world. Most of us depend on business for the kind of jobs we have. Many of us own some part of a business or receive some income from lending business our savings. Business is so common that we take it for granted, and use it without thinking much about it—just as we do any other familiar facility. And yet, even though we do not give as much thought to business in general, because of this pervasiveness of business in modern life, business is important in its relation to most people, not only because of what it does *for* them, but because of what it does *to* them. . . ."[1]

And then he added a definition:

"This is the business of business: first, to get things ready for use; second, to provide people for purposeful activities; and third, to give people a way to save productively a part of what they can earn. . . ."[2]

Business includes manufacturing, mining, growing, buying, selling, banking, investing, insuring, communicating, transporting—and the record keeping for all of these varied activities. Romantically enough, they can and do take place all over the earth and in outer space.

And, as George Bernard Shaw observed back in that auspicious year of 1929, the work of the businessman needs be neither dry nor dull:

"Modern businesses tend to become more interesting and important, and even more scientific, than average professional work. Their activities are much more varied: in fact modern commercial magnates, when they control a dozen different businesses, become better informed and better developed mentally than the rank and file of the professions. What is more, they are learning to snap up the ablest university scholars and civil servants, and take them into partnership not as office managers but as thinkers, diplomatists, and commercial scientists. It is in industrially undeveloped countries that professional men rank as an aristocracy of learning and intellect: in European centers today commercial society is a more effective reserve of culture than professional society. When the professional man or the public servant tells his son that a berth in the civil service is a blind alley, or doctoring at the call of the night bell a dog's life, contrasting them with the unlimited prospects and the infinite scope for personal initiative in business, he is recommending the young man to improve on his father's condition instead of starting him on the downward path socially." [3]

Surely, activities which are as different from one another as these are, and which involve the organization of men and nature are bound to be exciting.

Consider for a moment some aspects of our society which distinguish it from societies of the past. One: change [4] today is so rapid in all of technology that we cannot keep abreast of it—let alone comprehend fully where it is taking us. We have developed through computers the ability to handle masses of data so quickly that the time which once existed to contemplate philosophically what we might do in any given situation has disappeared. With the costs of computers declining sharply through microminiaturization they can become so common that early and quick solutions will be found to the lowest priority bottlenecks.

Two: in the times of affluence our productive capacity has become so great that we can turn out all the things which are needed to satisfy everyone in this country, at least. (Mr. Frederik Pohl, in one [5] of his brilliant science fiction stories, described a time in the not too distant future when everybody is forced to consume through a system of ration points everything being turned out by the robots as otherwise the population would be drowned in its own goods. The penalty, if anyone fell down on his obligation to consume the assigned amount, was more rations points which had to be consumed promptly!)

Three: the means to control population growth are available to mankind. The period of uninhibited and unceasing expansion of bodies on this limited globe is over.

Finally: there is the fact that communications are instantaneous and simple. The picture of the affluent life is flashed immediately to those who have not—no matter where they may be—and they are demanding a share of this affluence—NOW. The pressures on the "haves" to provide for the "have nots" are becoming more apparent daily.

It follows that

"Today's changes are so different in scope and kind as to constitute a new order of phenomena that dwarfs in social significance all past change—This, in fact, is a time of technological revolution." [6]

This revolution must be accepted, understood, evaluated and coped with.

The listing of these particular facets of society enables us to group some of the challenges of the world which lie within the peculiar ability of business to meet. So: society seeks to reduce economic poverty. Jobs are certainly a real solution to this—and businessmen are the creators of jobs. They can also help others to a stake in the society by helping them become entrepreneurs. There must be improvement in our physical environment. We must eliminate and prevent water and air pollution. The cityscape must be de-uglified. Businessmen, who may very well have created some of these negative conditions, can come up with the means to remove them.

Our cultural life must be enriched—for the advancement of technology is producing even more leisure, which is not used meaningfully will end in a fatal boredom.

(Let me digress here for a moment. The greatest danger to the world is not from the unfriendly explosion of fissionable materials, nor from the several instances of military belligerence abounding all over the world at the moment, nor from the unfulfilled wants of a large part of the world's population. Rather the danger to be feared is being bored to death. The living of life now is so intense that by the time we reach age 30 too many of us are going to find that there is little to do—except make trouble for ourselves.

(In this morning's Los Angeles Times there appears a story of a conference held this past week-end in San Francisco. Mr. Arnold Gingrich, publisher of Esquire magazine, suggested that American business should contribute one per cent of the five per cent amount permitted as a charitable deduction from federal income tax to "help support and stimulate" the development of outstanding programs in the arts.)

Henry Ford II recently summed up the challenges in another way when he declared in Detroit three weeks ago:

"What really counts, when we measure social purposes, is not the ingenuity of technology or the growth of natural product, but the quality of our society and our individual lives. The basic measures of social achievements are such things as human satisfaction and fulfillment and the growth of harmony, goodwill and respect among men." [7]

This, then, is a fourth element which must be added to Mr. Ruml's definition of the business of business: it is the business of business to improve the quality of our society and of our individual lives.

In the free enterprise society it is the businessmen—unusual ones, obviously—who are called upon by our politicians or professionals to apply their special organizational gifts to reduce poverty (Sargent Shriver), to change the physical environment (John T. Connor), and to help establish a broad cultural establishment (Roger L. Stevens and Edward Carter)—in short, to improve the quality of our society of our individual lives.

How do we—how do you—continue to meet these challenges?

Obviously, education in business is needed. But so also is education in the arts and humanities. Business is far too complicated to extend its best success—except in the rare instance—to the poorly rounded. A broad education is required to be able to identify the problems which affect a given business or a city or even the world, itself.

There is needed, too, an acceptance of the responsibilities which go with being in business. The responsibilities include, among others, the acknowledgement that business cannot be carried on in a vacuum, disregarding the interests of others in the same society and on the same planet. Where this acknowledgement is not forthcoming government will surely step in: witness laws concerning air and water pollution, conservation of natural resources, signs and billboard use, and hundreds of other ordinances which restrict business activities in a thousand different and detailed ways.

Pride in one's work and business is essential, too. Pride comes from turning out a product or performing a service in a manner which will be satisfying to the user. Our courts are far too clogged with litigation over physical injuries and financial damage arising out of defectively designed or made food products, drugs, vehicles and other objects,[8] signifying far too often a disregard for the welfare of users.

Finally, I think that none of these challenges will be met if there is not intelligent *action* by businessmen. Such action may even have to be participation in politics, or a volunteering for civic, social or charitable tasks. It may be by articulated questioning of traditional patterns of business and community behavior. Remember that our rules of behavior have been shaped in a society coping historically with the problems of scarcity—with conditions where there has not been enough of the good things to go all round. We must ask ourselves whether these same rules are adequate in coping with the problems of a society in which there is or will be more than enough to go around. The businessman cannot escape from the burden of Mr. Ford's charge that—

"The free enterprise system will not gain the respect and the acceptance it needs until all men share in the abundance that system provides."

You, my young friends, at the outset of your business careers, should be excited when confronted with a world which is filled with these challenges, or, looked at in another way, opportunities, since what is involved in taking on the challenges and surveying the opportunities is not at all inconsistent with the objectives and possibilities of making money. No apologies are needed, either. Mr. Shaw summed it up so nicely in the preface to "Major Barbara":

"Now to deplore this preference as sordid, and teach children that it is sinful to desire money, is to strain towards the extreme possible limit of impudence in lying and corruption in hypocrisy, civilization, the one sound spot in our social conscience. Money is the most important thing in the world. It represents health, strength, honor, generosity and beauty as conspicuously and undeniably as the want of it represents illness, weakness, disgrace, meanness and ugliness. Not the least of its virtues is that it destroys base people as certainly as it fortifies and dignifies noble people. It is only when it is cheapened to worthlessness for some and made impossibly dear to others, that it becomes a curse. In short, it is a curse only on such foolish social conditions that life itself is a curse. For the two things are inseparable: money is the counter that enables life to be distributed socially: it is life as truly as sovereigns and bank notes are money. The first duty of every citizen is to insist on having money on reasonable terms; and this demand is not complied with by giving four men three thousand pounds for nothing. The crying need of the nation is not for better morals, cheaper bread, temperance, liberty, culture, redemption of fallen sisters and erring brothers, nor the grace, love and fellowship of the Trinity, but simply for enough money. And the evil to be attacked is not sin, suffering, greed, priestcraft, kingcraft, demagogy, monopoly, ignorance, drink, war, pestilence, nor any other of the scapegoats which reformers sacrifice, but simply poverty."

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Tomorrow's Business,* Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., New York, 1945, pp. 29–32.

[2] *Supra,* note 1.

[3] *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism, Sovietism, and Fascism,* Constable and Company, 1929, pp. 170–171.

[4] See generally, *Technology and the American Economy, Report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.* February, 1966.

[5] In "The Midas Touch."

[6] *The Guaranteed Income,* edited by Robert Theobald, Doubleday, 1966, p. 29 and following.

[7] Before the 51st Annual Convention of the National Association of Purchasing Agents, May 3, 1966. Quoted in *The New York Times,* May 4, 1966, p. 26.

[8] On the other hand, I suspect that a buyer who claims he has been defrauded may have been attracted to the seller, in the first place, thinking that he, the buyer, would "take" the seller. *Caveat vendor!*

Mississippi Dairy Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, dramatic economic progress is being achieved in Mississippi through a bold industrialization program which has accelerated growth at an unprecedented rate. But agriculture—long the heart and soul of the State's economy—continues to play a vital role in this upsurge as our farmers work with renewed enthusiasm to build a better way of life for themselves and for their respective communities.

The flourishing Mississippi dairy industry is an example of a segment of agriculture which is adding momentum to our upsurge in prosperity. The spectacular progressive development in dairying in Mississippi is particularly significant at a time when the dairy industry is experiencing a sharp decline in many other sections of the Nation.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, Mississippi was the only Southern State which produced enough milk to fill the demands of its own residents. For a number of years now, our dairy farmers have exported about 40 percent of their grade A milk into adjoining States. The total production last year rose to more than a billion pounds of good quality milk and the industry, both directly and indirectly, is now contributing $130 million annually to the State's economy.

Dairy dollars are earned and spent in every county in Mississippi. Dairying generates employment. An estimated 25,000 people in Mississippi are primarily employed in producing, processing, manufacturing and selling dairying foods. They include about 8,000 dairy farmers, managers and employees of 25 pasteurizing plants, 4 butter and dry milk plants, 4 condenseries, 8 cheese plants, 22 ice cream manufacturing, and 380 retail ice cream establishments. In addition, many allied industries in Mississippi depend entirely or in part on dairying including dairy equipment dealers, manufacturers and dealers in feed, fertilizer, seed and general farm equipment, pesticides and building materials; dealers in petroleum products; transportation and other services.

The remarkable increase in both productivity and earnings in the past decade illustrate best the dynamic new significance of dairying in Mississippi. Last year, for instance, our grade A dairy farmers marketed 787 million pounds of milk—an increase of 36 percent in the 10-year span. Cash receipts in this category rose by 39 percent and producer milk exported increased by 22 percent in those years. In the past year alone production per cow increased 6.4 percent over 1964.

What has been responsible for this unique record of progress? Of course, favorable climate, temperature and natural resources have each hard a hand. But the real key to this progress is the improved management and techniques of Mississippi dairy farmers who are meeting the challenge of keeping pace with progress.

Walthall County in my congressional district is known as the "Cream Pitcher" of Mississippi because it produces more milk than any other county in the State. A recent edition of the Tylertown Times published in the county outlines the impact of the dairy industry in the area economy.

Here is the nutshell story from the Times:

Walthall County has a population of 13,512 people and 10,000 dairy cows. Dairying accounts for a whopping $4 million annually—or one-third of $12 million total. Dairying there has grown from a million-dollar industry in less than 25 years. The growth stands as a monument to farm and business leaders who worked hand in hand to improve the entire economic life of the county.

The exciting Walthall County story is typical of what is happening throughout the State. Mississippi will undoubtedly enjoy continued progress and the State's dairy industry will be a part of that growth as new production goals and income advances are achieved.

How Effective Is Our Blacklist of Ships Doing Business With Cuba and North Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in this year's minority views of the report of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, we spoke of the number of free-world-flag ships that are transporting supplies and materials to North Vietnam. Chief among the offenders in this regard is Great Britain. Great Britain is also the leading offender among the free world nations in numbers of ships carrying goods to Fidel Castro.

The facts are that 36 free world ships called at North Vietnamese ports in the first quarter of 1966, 29 of which were British, and the further facts are that 67 free world ships, 26 of which were British, have visited Cuba during the same period.

This lends considerable credence to an article which recently appeared in Navy magazine for July 1966. The article points out that U.S. policy regarding this shipping problem is weak and ineffectual. It further points out that the British can and do prevent the shipping of other nations from aiding Rhodesia and in this venture we have cooperated with them. However, they have hardly lifted a finger to aid us in stopping aggression by Castro and Ho Chi Minh. I, therefore, commend this article to the attention of my colleagues.

HOW EFFECTIVE IS OUR BLACKLIST OF SHIPS DOING BUSINESS WITH CUBA AND NORTH VIET NAM?

(By Helen Delich Bentley, Maritime Editor, the Baltimore Sun)

While the United States' Ambassador to the United Nations fought vigorously for passage by the Security Council of the toughest economic sanctions ever voted by the U.N. in order to support Great Britain's stand against Rhodesia's defiant government, more British-flag ships were being added to America's blacklist for calling both at Cuba and North Viet Nam.

The addition of the British vessels to these blacklists—inaugurated by the United States against two countries it considers real enemies—is nothing unusual, because ships flying the Union Jack head both lists.

But it points up the ironic—almost ridiculous situation of the United States as far as international shipping is concerned.

Perhaps this was best illustrated in a cartoon printed recently in a Western newspaper. The drawing depicts a British navy captain on the bridge of his frigate looking through a telescope. On a nearby chart is marked a big "success" for having diverted a Greek-flag tanker bound for Mozambique to deliver oil to Rhodesia. Passing directly in front of the Navy vessel is a British-flag tanker laden with Soviet MIGS on its deck and oil in its holds with the words "North Viet Nam" emblazoned on its sides.

"This one can go because it is not heading to our enemy," remarked the British captain.

Ambassador Arthur Goldberg led a Security Council sit-in until the economic sanctions were voted. Those sanctions call for Britain "to employ all measures including armed force" to crush the Rhodesian regime of Premier Ian Smith. Rhodesia is a (former) colony of Great Britain in a continent somewhat removed from the United Kingdom.

Compare this series of moves to Great Britain's response when the United States called upon the countries of the Free World to stop their ships from going to Cuba, which had become Communist-dominated and armed with Russian missiles only 90 miles from the shores of the United States. Britain's Government accused this country of trying to control the seas and declared Uncle Sam was interfering with the freedom of the seas.

The United Kingdom stated it would not attempt to halt its shipowners from serving Cuba. It obviously has not, since more British ships are regularly being added to the blacklist. Of the 251 Free World and Polish vessels now on the official Cuban blacklist, 72 are British.

COULDN'T CARE LESS

But even more significant is the fact that British-flag ships have made 463 trips or nearly 45 per cent of the 1,157 voyages made to Cuba by Free World and Polish vessels since the United States inaugurated its blacklist on January 1, 1963.

Of the 10 ships on the North Viet Nam blacklist—which became effective as of January 25, 1966, months after the buildup in South Viet Nam was announced by President Johnson—seven are British. Great Britain has used the lame excuse that it cannot control the ships in Hong Kong. However, Greece did strip one of its tankers of its registry when it appeared in Beira with oil for Rhodesia.

When the United States protested Great Britain's sale of buses and other equipment to Cuba, the U.K. defied the protest and proceeded with the sale and shipment. Therefore, when it states that it cannot control the Hong Kong ships, there is a serious question whether Great Britain wants to.

Greece's stripping of the tanker's registry is another note of irony in the international shipping picture. Although the Greek Government has issued Royal Decrees forbidding any of its ships to call at Cuba or North Viet Nam, Greek-flag vessels still are going to both countries. Some 35 of the ships on the Cuban blacklist belong to Greece, while two of the 10 going to North Viet Nam also are registered in that Mediterranean country.

'WORLD OPINION'

It would appear that the only reason the Greek government seized the registry of the *Joanna V* is because it had become an international issue with blazing headlines in every country in the world.

In January, the State Department reported that Free World ships trading with North Viet Nam had declinied from 34 per month in 1964 to 13 per month in the latter part of 1965. The blacklist became effective as of January 25, 1966, and the number may have declined even further, although no other figures have been issued.

However, it has been said on Capitol Hill that many of the ships transporting goods to North Viet Nam no longer are going directly there, but discharging their cargoes in Hong Kong for transshipment to the Communist country.

Thomas W. Gleason, president of the International Longshoremen's Association (AFL–CIO), who has been working with United States Government officials to break the logjam in shipping in the Republic of Viet Nam ports, told the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee that he has viewed English, Panamanian, Greek and other ships in Hong Kong, "supposedly bringing in cargo for Hong Kong."

"But this stuff," he continued, "would be transferred into the small coastal vessels operated either by Chinamen or a few North Vietnamese or Crown Colony ships, and brought down into Haiphong for final discharge there."

Soviet Union ships also are running from Hong Kong to Haiphong, according to Lloyd's Weekly Shipping Index.

Although the United States' blacklist as such is considered weak and somewhat inconsequential in this country, there is a definite principle which our friends are defying. It is considered weak because the only thing the blacklist does is prevent the ships listed thereon from calling at United States ports to pick up Government-financed cargoes.

However, these blacklisted ships can:

1. Pick up commercial cargoes in American ports, if the longshoremen will load them.
2. Pick up United States Government-financed (through counterpart funds) cargoes in foreign ports.

And then, of course, when the owner feels that his trips to Cuba or North Viet Nam are not as remunerative as they might be if he picks up U.S. aid cargo in American ports, all he has to do is sign a pledge that he'll never send that ship again to that area. Ninety-one vessels—including 39 British and 25 Greek—have been freed from the Cuba blacklist in this manner.

The International Longshoremen's Association (AFL–CIO) succeeded in imposing a more stringent boycott of ships serving Cuba for two years after the Cuban crisis, but it has waned somewhat because of the difficulty in keeping track of the ships.

UNION SHOWS WAY

But the ILA refused to handle the ships of any owner who might have had even a single ship calling at Cuba. The union boycott went into effect three months before the U.C. government did anything officially.

Likewise in the case of North Viet Nam, the maritime unions began pressing to boycott or bar ships from the United States long before any official action was taken. Various Congressmen picked up their complaints and introduced legislation which would do everything from preventing such ships from ever calling at the United States again to stopping any ship from any country which had a single vessel going to North Viet Nam from calling in an American port. These bills are languishing on Capitol Hill and probably will never see daylight.

Even when Congress passed an amendment to the foreign aid bill that prevented doling out any money to any nation whose ships were calling at Cuba, the Executive Department chose to ignore that order.

When the State Department first decided to lift the blacklist from the ships of owners who "took the pledge" not to send the ship into Cuba again (a similar pledge is available in the instance of North Viet Nam), the longshoremen refused to go along and clear these ships.

The test case was the SS *Tulse Hills*, an American-built liberty sold after the war to help rehabilitate the Greek merchant marine and subsequently switched to British registry by the Mavroleon Kulukundis interests when they headquartered in London.

The *Tulse Hills* arrived in Baltimore shortly after the agreement was signed between Basil Mavroleon—whose combine had the most ships in the Cuban trade—and the State Department. Baltimore longshoremen—all members of the International Longshoremen's Association (AFL–CIO)—refused to load the grain aboard the vessel. The owners took the dockworkers to court and went up through the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, which concurred that no force could make an individual load a particular vessel or do a special job if he did not want to.

After 137 days of waiting the *Tulse Hills* departed from Baltimore without any fanfare and without its cargo. The dockworkers again proved that their "blacklist" was more potent than the Government's.

In addition to the Greek and British ships on the Cuba blacklist, there are 57 Lebanese, 18 Polish, 18 Cypriot, 14 Italian, 9 Yugoslav, 7 French, 5 Moroccan, 5 Maltese, 4 Finnish, 2 Dutch, 2 Norwegian, 2 Swedish, and one from Monaco.

A number of these have since changed their register by the same owner or been sold to another owner and registered in another country. However, their new identity also is carried on the blacklist published regularly by the Maritime Administration. As a result, the current list includes such countries as South Africa, Panama, Guinea, Haiti, Liberia and Nationalist China.

MANY ARE U.S.-BUILT

There are many ironies in this blacklist-boycott picture. For instance, a substantial portion of the ships on the list are former Liberty vessels built in the United States during World War II and sold to the friendly nations at a cheap price to help them get their merchant marines going after the war. Both Panama and Liberia issued proclamations that no ships in their registry could serve Cuba and yet six have been transferred to those countries and now are appearing on the list.

A number of the ships registered in both Lebanon and Cyprus are owned by Greeks who are somewhat concerned that their own nation might seize their registries, so they charged over first. Lebanon and Cyprus can both be considered "flags of convenience," along with Panama, Liberia, and Honduras, for shipowners, although it is believed that no American shipowners have transferred any vessels to the Middle East area.

Some American shipping circles have expressed grave concern over the fact that the Security Council upheld London's position on the Rhodesian boycott so strongly. They note that morality of Britain's dispute with Rhodesia is one thing, but the morality of the kind of blockade-enforced boycott is another.

What would Great Britain's reaction be, they ask, if the United States should seek a similar boycott against both Cuba and North Viet Nam—a country with which American troops are at war and losing their lives?

DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

It also is noted that perhaps a dangerous precedent has been set and they ask what would happen if the situation should be reversed: A Communist-oriented power decided to apply heavy pressure on a neighbor friendly to the West, declares a boycott and then goes not to the Security Council but to the General Assembly of the United Nations for approval of stronger measures, including a blockade. The conclusion is that western maritime nations may find themselves in a most embarrasing position.

And the big question is whether Great Britain, with one of the largest mercantile fleets afloat, would defy that blockade in the same manner it has the blacklists of the United States?

Rees Announces Results of 1966 Questionnaire to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. REES
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, this May I sent to my constituents in California's 26th Congressional District my annual congressional questionnaire. The response was immediate and enthusiastic, and I would like to thank the more than 12,000 citizens who were sufficiently concerned to take the time to complete and return this poll.

My congressional district is in the western section of Los Angeles County and includes the cities of Beverly Hills and Culver City; the Los Angeles City communities of Rancho Park, Venice, Mar Vista, Westdale, West Los Angeles, Cheviot Hills, Beverlywood, West Adams, and Fairfax Avenue; as well as the Los Angeles County areas of Marina del Rey, West Hollywood, and the Sunset Strip. Incomes range from lower middle to upper; a majority of my constituents are homeowners, and their educational level is higher than average.

The questions were written to reflect issues of particular concern to my district, as well as the current major national and international issues. In the multiple-choice questions many respondents chose several alternatives. Because of this some percentages add up to more than 100 percent. Also particularly gratifying was the high degree of respondents who further elaborated their views with notes and letters. I regret that space limitations make it impossible for me to share these comments with my colleagues as, having read them, I can testify to the worthwhile nature of the overwhelming majority of the statements.

Knowing that my colleagues in Congress will be interested in the response of my constituents to the vital issues of the day, I include here the tabulated results of this poll:

Rees 1966 congressional questionnaire survey compilation

FOREIGN POLICY

1. Vietnam: Which policy do you favor for the United States in Vietnam?

	Percent favoring
(a) Continue the administration policy of supporting the South Vietnamese, including limited bombing attacks in the north, while actively seeking a peaceful solution to the situation	23
(b) Expand the war to achieve a complete military victory	25
(c) Restrict our military efforts with the view to pulling out in the near future whether a peaceful solution can be developed or not	17
(d) Push for immediate elections in South Vietnam and let the new government negotiate its own solution with all essential elements involved	45

2. Communist China: Our policy should be to:

(a) Oppose admission of Communist China to the United Nations	27
(b) Extend United States diplomatic recognition to Communist China	37
(c) Initiate such programs as trade in non-strategic goods, cultural exchanges and exchanges of news reporters with the Communist Chinese	43

3. The Middle East: Arab League nations, led by Egypt, have refused to sign a peace treaty with Israel and have harassed her with constant threats of war, worldwide economic boycotts, and the closing of the Suez Canal to Israeli ships. The United States should:

(a) Continue to supply arms to Arab nations to lessen their dependence on Soviet arms	4
(b) Continue to supply arms to Israel to maintain an arms parity in the Middle East	18
(c) Refuse any aid, including wheat, etc., to countries engaging in aggressive acts toward Israel	36
(d) Demand that an international meeting be called to draft a peace treaty between Israel and the Arab League nations	55

4. Latin American policy: The United States last year sent American troops to the Dominican Republic when it was suspected that far left and possibly Communist elements might be taking over the Government.

(a) The United States should not have acted unilaterally, but should have operated through the Organization of American States or through the United Nations	32
(b) The United States should send troops to any Western Hemisphere country where Communist takeover is suspected	29
(c) In the future, the United States, or the international body through which it is acting, should be far more careful to ascertain the true nature of the elements involved before stepping into such a power struggle	43

DOMESTIC POLICY

1. Vietnam and the President's domestic program: There have been some congressional demands that domestic programs be curtailed because of the increasing cost of the war in Vietnam. Such programs would include the War on Poverty, aid to education, and urban area aid, such as housing and transit. Would you favor—

	Percent
(a) Maintaining these programs and the war in Vietnam, even if a tax increase becomes necessary?	22
(b) Curtailing these programs to provide additional funds for the Vietnam struggle?	37
(c) Expanding these programs?	31

2. Transit: Recently I introduced legislation which would authorize the use of Federal gas tax funds, now being used exclusively for highways, for local rapid transit development.

Would you favor this proposal?

Yes	75
No	18

3. Air pollution: There are currently many bills before Congress dealing with air pollution, including proposals for mandatory installation of anti-smog devices on all new cars, the establishment of national air purity standards, and a special tax on industries creating air pollution.

Would you favor this type of more active Federal participation in the fight against smog?

Yes	80
No	15

4. Federal aid to urban areas: Do you feel that Federal aid to metropolitan areas for projects such as open spaces and parks, rapid transit, housing and community development should be withheld from cities which refuse to participate in minimal cooperative regional planning?

Yes	70
No	20

5. Civil rights: Recently the President proposed minimal legislation to combat racial and religious discrimination in the sale and/or rental of housing.

Would you favor such a proposal?

Yes	55
No	38

Legislation has also been introduced to prohibit racial discrimination in the selection of juries.

Would you favor such a proposal?

Yes	85
No	13

6. Bills are presently pending before Congress offering solutions to the following problems. Which do you feel should receive the most immediate attention? (Constituents were instructed to rank 12 alternatives in order of importance. Percentages are shown for those five preferences ranking the highest.)

Education	65
Civil Rights	52
Unemployment	50
Crime	48
Air Pollution	42

The Wages of Hatred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to think about the commonsense approach to civil rights when the conditions in the Negro ghettoes in our largest cities are so very bad. But the commonsense approach is impossible to even discuss when these communities erupt into the kind of violence we have witnessed in the past week in Chicago, New York, and Cleveland.

In connection with this problem I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following very sensible editorial from the July 18, 1966, edition of the Wall Street Journal:

THE WAGES OF HATRED

Not quite a year ago, in the wake of Watts, we observed in this space:

". . . the civil rights leadership should turn from its spectacular displays and occasional rabble-rousing and devote itself to a far greater degree to Negro individuals, Negro children, Negro families; to education in the home and group as well as in the school."

It is not an especially original thought, but the intervening twelve-month, sadly, has only given it greater pertinence. For in some ways race relations are if anything worse, as the nation now witnesses violence and death in Chicago while Watts itself and other areas are said to be at flash-point.

Part of the worsening is an increasing bitterness toward the white man among some elements of the Negro community. It is strange, although to an extent understandable, that the more civil rights legislation is piled onto the statute books, the more Federal money poured into attempts at Negro betterment, the more help freely proffered by businesses and individuals—the more the anger rises. To the extent it is understandable, the reason is that none of these efforts have accomplished much.

The darker mood can be sensed in the anti-white militancy of certain groups, perhaps small and insignificant, perhaps not; the ones reportedly arming themselves and training in paramilitary fashion (there was no lack of arms in Chicago these past several days). Not surprisingly, the ugly mood has found sudden articulation in a single phrase, "black power."

The men who gave currency to the term have been trying to tone it down ever since, suggesting it means only a fresh initiative on the part of Negroes to work for their advancement, which would be all to the good. But also present are the connotation of black racism, the demagogic appeal to hatred of the whites, the implication of seizing by force what the majority has built up over generations of painful effort.

In the divisiveness currently afflicting the civil rights movement, such leaders are called militant, as distinguished from "moderates" like Martin Luther King. Moderation, though, seems to have a peculiar definition in this context.

The King organization came to Chicago ostensibly to transform it into a just and open city; in fact, they made no bones about intending to spread civil disobedience in order to force the "power structure" to undertake radical improvements in Negro conditions. There is even a term for that too, albeit a somewhat self-contradictory one: "Militant nonviolence."

Here is the minister himself speaking a few days ago about disrupting the flow of the city: "I know it will be rough on (Chicago city officials) when they have to get 200 people off the Dan Ryan (expressway), but the only thing I can tell them is: Which do you prefer, this or a riot?" Somehow "militant nonviolence" does not seem to have averted night after night of murdering rioting, necessitating the intervention of the National Guard.

Moreover, this "moderate" attitude bespeaks more than a slight overtone of the same bitterness and hatred conveyed by the militants. All in all, it is further alienating the support of the white liberals who have been in the forefront of the movement; what else can be expected when a civil rights leader calls super-liberal Hubert Humphrey a racist?

We fear that the hatred and violence are also alienating the generally passive support of the majority, most of whom, including us, would like to see the Negro get every break a citizen deserves. But who needs this—year after year of disorder, preachment of contempt of the law, taking to the streets in orgies of pillage and shooting?

The leaders might reflect on a simple fact acknowledged by Martin Luther King: The Negro population is only 10% or 11% of the whole. Only a minority of that minority participates in the rampages, but the point for the leaders to understand is that the Negro needs the white man far more than the other way around.

And so we can only end as we did a year ago, except less hopefully. Not all the Federal aid or private help imaginable can lift the Negroes as a group into instant contentment. It will be slow at best, and most of the progress will have to be made by the Negroes themselves. That is the way the world is.

If, instead, the leadership keeps turning on the white man, it is exceedingly hard to be optimistic about the chances for any substantial progress in the future.

The Case Against Dams in the Grand Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr Speaker, it has been encouraging to note that residents of Arizona are speaking out against the proposal to build dams in the Grand Canyon.

An editorial in the Navajo Times, published at Window Rock, Ariz., argues for preservation of the Grand Canyon intact. I submit this editorial for inclusion in the RECORD.

The relationship of the Grand Canyon dam proposal to the future of the Indian tribes in the area has been studied by Dr. Stephen C. Jett, a geographer who has specialized in southwestern resource management. Dr. Jett is the author of "Tourism in the Navajo Country: Resources and Planning," which is being published by the Navajo Tribal Museum.

Dr. Jett concludes that construction of Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dams would result in a net loss of economic opportunities for these tribes.

His letter in the Navajo Times explores, in summary, the implications of the current proposals. This letter is offered herewith for the information of my colleagues.

GRAND CANYON GIVEAWAY

The West needs water—and should have federal help in getting it. But not at the expense of the Grand Canyon.

Congress is getting ready to act on a clumsy, costly and unimaginative plan to finance a diversion of Colorado River waters to dry areas of Arizona.

The U.S. Reclamation Bureau wants to slap up two dams, a $511,000,000 job just below Grand Canyon National Park and a $360,000,000 structure just above it. The impoundments would flood 13 miles of the inner canyon within the national park.

This abuse of a natural wonder might be justified as a last-resort measure if this plan alone would provide the needed water. But that's not even the purpose of the plan.

Instead, the dams are intended merely as a financing device. They would produce hydro-electric power, the sale of which would pay for a $500,000,000 aqueduct.

This is absurd. If the Government wants to finance the aqueduct by power sales it could do so much more cheaply and efficiently by building steam or nuclear generating plants.

The architects of this clumsy scheme obviously don't dare risk a proposal to go into the power business in a businesslike way—locating efficient steam or nuclear plants near potential markets. (Most of the ultimate consumers are in California.) This would draw down on them the ire of a well-organized private power lobby.

Instead, under the guise of a "reclamation" project, they prefer to take something away from all the people, who don't have well-healed lobbyists to protest. (The Cleveland Press)

Mr. CHET MACRORIE,
Editor, The Navajo Times,
Window Rock, Ariz.

DEAR SIR: At the end of last month, a conference was held at the Grand Canyon to discuss proposals to construct hydroelectric dams (Bridge Canyon Dam and Marble Canyon Dam) in the Grand Canyon. As an Assistant Professor of Geography whose area of regional interest in the Southwest, with an emphasis on resource management, I was invited to attend this conference. I looked for representatives of the Navajo Tribe, who would presumably take a great interest in this matter, but saw none. I looked for mention of the conference in the Navajo Times, to which I subscribe, but found none. Therefore, since I have a particular interest in the Navajo country, having written the book "Tourism in the Navajo Country: Resources and Planning," now being published by the Navajo Tribal Museum, I am taking it upon myself to bring this matter to the attention of the Tribe, although I note with satisfaction that the Editor of the Navajo Times appears already (March 17, 1966, p. 4) to have spoken out in opposition to these dams.

One of the two proposed reservoir sites, Marble Canyon, would inundate a portion of the Navajo Reservation. In my study of the resources for tourism on the Reservation, I recommend that the Tribe oppose the dam, since it would cause great damage to the scenic values of Marble Canyon, which is essentially an upstream extension of the Grand Canyon. This portion of the Grand Canyon is owned by the Navajo Tribe and could with relatively little difficulty be developed as a scenic attraction by the Tribe. Since the Grand Canyon is one of the world's most visited scenic spots and since this dedevelopment of the "East Rim" of the Canyon is possible, it would seem to be to the advantage of the Tribe to keep the scenery intact. In contrast to these development possibilities, which would cause visitors to linger and spend money on the Reservation, the reservoir that would be created by the dam would probably have its only point of access at Lees Ferry, entirely off the Reservation. Access from the Reservation side would be very difficult.

If, on the other hand, the Tribe did not permit the construction of this dam, whose function is to generate electricity to pay for the Central Arizona irrigation project, then alternative means of power production would have to be sought, in which event the Tribe would stand to profit from an increased demand for Black Mesa coal and/or Reservation uranium.

Since half of the reservoir site is on the Navajo Reservation, and since no representative of the Navajo Tribe was present at the conference, I inquired of Barry Goldwater, who also attended the conference, what measures had been taken to obtain the Tribe's permission to flood part of their Reservation. He said that to his knowledge, the Navajos hadn't been consulted. Let's don't let the Bureau of Reclamation do to the Navajos what the Corps of Engineers did to the Seneca Indians recently, flooding forever a portion of their homeland in violation of their treaty with the United States Government.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN C. JETT,
Assistant Professor of Geography.

The John F. Kennedy Peace Forest in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, this July fourth, thousands of Americans joined the people of Israel in dedicating a unique, living and ever-growing memorial to the late President John F. Kennedy.

The memorial is a stone monument in the shape of a tree trunk, representing untimely death, and surrounded by land which will become the "John F. Kennedy Peace Forest." On this land, there will be a tree planted for every American of the Jewish faith.

The Jewish National Fund raised money for the memorial whose symbolism so impressed Chief Justice Earl Warren, that, upon seeing the site, he revised his dedicatory remarks, according to the New York Times report. I insert the full New York Times story, since I believe it reflects the confidence the late President Kennedy had in the future of the spirited young State of Israel.

WARREN DEDICATES KENNEDY MEMORIAL IN ISRAEL

(By James Feron)

JERUSALEM (ISRAEL SECTOR), July 4.—A memorial to President Kennedy was dedicated in an informal atmosphere this morning atop a barren but historic hill outside Jerusalem.

Nearly 2,000 official guests, including many from the United States, were joined by hundreds of enthusiastic American students and tourists as well as throngs of Israelis in the small plaza facing the memorial.

Chief Justice Earl Warren, whose enthusiasm for the dramatic memorial after he had seen it for the first time, redrafted his dedicatory speech. He praised the striking symbolism, a tree trunk representing untimely death.

Justice Warren also said that the Kennedy Peace Forest planted on the slopes of the memorial hill, would have "greatly pleased" the young President.

"Something more than mere surmise justifies my statement," Justice Warren said.

He recalled Mr. Kennedy's words in a speech eight years ago when the then junior Senator from Massachusetts told a Jewish National Fund meeting:

"What work could be more heartwarming or more enduring than the great forest at Jerusalem. Your children and grandchildren when they visit Israel will find your monument."

PICNIC ATMOSPHERE

Now they will also find a monument to Mr. Kennedy, dedicated on a July 4 with dignity and affection by Israeli and American leaders before thousands who seemed to relish the occasion. At times the milling throng lent a picnic atmosphere to the event.

The Jewish National Fund, which raised money for the memorial in the United States, posted general invitations in hotels this morning. In addition, hundreds of young Americans who are studying and touring in Israel made their way to the site.

The memorial is five miles from the nearest regular bus at the end of a winding road leading through two moshavim, or communal settlements. Several miles southwest of Jerusalem's outskirts and standing atop the highest hill in the vicinity, the memorial overlooks a border valley containing the Tel Aviv-Jerusalem railway and the Jordanian village of Bittir.

This is the site of ancient Betar, the last stronghold of Simon Bar Kochba's revolt against the Romans in A.D. 132–135. The Jewish army of insurrection, numbering 200,000, fought the Roman legions until overwhelmed on these slopes.

CHILDREN'S BAND PLAYS

To open the proceedings a children's band played "Hatikva," the Israeli national anthem, and then made a valiant attempt at "The Star-Spangled Banner." The American anthem, played slowly by the children, was picked up by strong voices until the music swept the audience.

Speaker after speaker standing before the sturdy monument, which was designed by the Israeli architect David Reznik, drew attention to its symbolism and to the significance of the growing trees around it.

Jacob Tsur, world president of the Jewish National Fund, said it had been "conceived in the shape of a mighty trunk of a fallen tree, among the thousands of saplings which will grow one day into a great forest."

Walworth Barbour, the American Ambassador to Israel, recalled that Mr. Kennedy had said, "A nation reveals itself not only by the men it produces but also by the men it honors, the men it remembers."

"In thus honoring and remembering the late President Kennedy," Mr. Barbour said, "the men and women of the Jewish National Fund honor themselves—beyond and above the glory they have already earned in their work for Israel."

Justice Warren observed that Washington had "more than its share of edifices in stone and bronze," but he paid special tribute to what he described as the "living memorial" being planted for Mr. Kennedy in Israel.

Justice Warren said that Mr. Kennedy had "a very special feeling for this nation and an unwavering confidence in its future." He added that Mr. Kennedy visited here first in 1939 when it was still a British mandate. He next came in 1951 and Justice Warren spoke these words that Mr. Kennedy had used on that occasion:

"Perhaps the greatest change of all I found in the hearts and minds of the people. For unlike the discouraged settlers of 1939 they looked to the future with hope. I found a revival of an ancient spirit."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*	1200 S. Courthouse Rd., Arlington, Va.
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*	
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1202 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	1705 Longworth House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg*	914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*	
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Fogarty, John E., *R.I*	1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*	301 G St. SW.
Grider, George W., *Tenn*	119 7th St. SE.
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George, *Idaho*	
Hansen, John R., *Iowa*	800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	3424 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	4517 Wetherill Dr., Westmoreland Hills, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y*	The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
King, David S., *Utah*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*	
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	

Appendix

The Escalation of Frightfulness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have often said that escalation breeds escalation, that our increased military effort can be expected to meet with stiffened resistance rather than a crumbling into a suit for peace.

The distinguished dean of political columnists, Walter Lippmann, takes the same view and uses a similar phrase when he speaks, as he did in yesterday's Washington Post, of the "vicious spiral in frightfulness" toward which the war in Vietnam is tending.

"Frightfulness begets frightfulness," says Mr. Lippmann, in pointing out the fact that efforts to destroy the will to fight lead ever upward to an "escalation of frightfulness." In this, as he points out, "we are approaching the point of no return," leading to irrational rather than rational solution. We certainly need, as Mr. Lippmann concludes, to support the civilized conscience of mankind by interrupting and breaking the vicious spiral in which we are caught up.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lippmann's column may appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW: THE ESCALATION OF FRIGHTFULNESS

(By Walter Lippmann)

Because the Vietnamese war cannot be decided by military means, it has become increasingly a vicious spiral in frightfulness. Because it is both a civil war of Vietnamese against Vietnamese and at the same time a war of Vietnamese against foreign white men, it is, as such wars usually are, increasingly ferocious and barbarous. Unable to subdue the other side by conventional military actions, each side tries to overcome the enemy by destroying his will to fight. Frightfulness begets frightfulness and anger demands vengeance, and all that remains is a fury which, insofar as it reasons at all, thinks that by topping frightfulness with more frightfulness, the enemy will be silenced and paralyzed.

The world is now confronted with this escalation of frightfulness. To the American threat to bomb closer and closer to the populated regions of North Vietnam, Hanoi is replying by increasing its mobilization, by evacuating the civilian population from Hanoi and Haiphong, and by threatening to try the captive American fliers, humiliate them, and use them as hostages in the war of frightfulness, and, in the end, perhaps even to execute them.

There is no doubt that this treatment of the fliers would evoke dire reprisals. The warning of Secretary General U Thant and the declaration of the Senators who have dissented from the Johnson policy in the war are accurate. They are telling the truth in calling the attention of Hanoi to the fact that the punishment of the prisoners of war would make the war, frightful as it is already, still more frightful. For the ultimate weapons of frightfulness are in the hands of the United States, and no one who knows this country and the character of the President can be sure that they will not be used if the escalation of frightfulness continues.

In this escalation we are approaching the point of no return, the point where the war becomes inexpiable, where it becomes incapable of rational solution, where it becomes a war of endless killing, a suicidal war of extermination. The war is not yet at that point. But the war will pass that point of no return if the prisoners are executed and the North Vietnamese cities are destroyed in retaliation.

There is great honor and glory to be had by anyone speaking for the civilized conscience of mankind, who interrupts and breaks the vicious spiral.

Reform Our Election and Campaign Statutes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, in the space age, with the advances in the modern techniques of communication, the costs of political campaigning have been skyrocketing at an alarming rate.

Political campaigns have been conducted since the founding of our Nation, yet no adequate rules and regulations or guidelines have been established for the guidance of political parties or candidates for office. This applies to Federal, State, municipal, and other local candidates for office. We can be justly proud that in our beloved Nation, the people choose their candidates and vote for candidates of their choice and exercise other privileges in free elections.

I firmly believe that the Congress should take a good hard look at the problem, through the established legislative process. I would strongly recommend that public hearings be held on pending legislation to examine the subject of campaign costs and expenditures. I would express the hope that some appropriate guidelines be established for candidates for public office; of course, I refer in particular to candidates in presidential and congressional elections.

It is quite possible that we may not be able to solve this problem by the passage of a single piece of legislation. It may very well be that we will have to work toward enactment of a number of legislative reforms, including some proposed by the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress. The subject deserves continuing study, with consideration to tax incentive legislation to encourage small campaign contributions and stricter rules governing reporting of campaign contributions and expenditures by candidates. The tax incentive bills have a worthy purpose in encouraging greater participation of citizens in the political affairs of government.

With respect to campaign expenses, I support legislation to provide a tax incentive for small contributions, under $100, in order to encourage a broader segment of our society to participate in the political process. In addition I believe our outdated laws governing the reporting of campaign expenditures on the part of candidates should be revised and updated.

There have been many proposals for reforming our Federal and State laws on this subject. Some are controversial but all are in the spirit of constructive criticism of our present laws and point up the lack of appropriate guidelines, indicating the need for legislation. The evolution of legislation is derived from dialog, debate, and decision. For that reason it is my hope that while we may not solve all the problems connected with the high cost of campaigning, we can make a start in that direction.

Recently I came across an article in the June 27 edition of the Nation entitled "Campaign Costs Are Soaring" by Victor H. Bernstein. I believe my colleagues will find the article informative and interesting and I insert the article in the RECORD at this point:

PRIVATE WEALTH AND PUBLIC OFFICE: THE HIGH COST OF CAMPAIGNING

(Victor H. Bernstein)

The cost of political campaigning imposes on the office seeker a qualification not specified in the Constitution: he must either be rich or have rich friends. Perhaps because he qualified so handsomely on both counts, the late John F. Kennedy showed himself to be more sensitive to this situation than have most of our Presidents, and shortly after taking office he appointed a Commission on Campaign Costs empowered to recommend more democratic ways of gilding the path to public office.

The commission made its report to the White House in April, 1962, where for four years it lay (presumably lightly) on the conscience of Mr. Kennedy's successor. At any rate, at the end of May, 1966 (whether by design or not, probably too late for legislative action this election year) President Johnson laid before Congress a series of proposals which in some respects follow the commission's recommendations, but in others depart from them considerably. His proposals are analyzed in detail elsewhere in this article.

These developments have been stimulated by a steady and staggering rise in the cost of political campaigning. A four-year lease on the White House runs to many millions of dollars. A Senate seat can cost a million or more (a fact which accounts, at least in part, for the current travail of Sen. Thomas E. Dodd). More than $2 million was spent to make John Lindsay mayor of New York; even a House race, if it is in a competitive metropolitan district, may require $50,000 for the nomination campaign, and as much again for election. In 1964, the country's political campaign bills (including all races from dog catcher to President) totaled an estimated $200 million. This year, with the White House lease still unexpired, the bill is likely to be somewhat smaller—say $175 million, with the bulk spent at State levels. Do these formidable sums account for the prevalence of riches among our leading politicians (Rockefeller, Kennedy, Harriman, Romney, Pell, Ottinger, Johnson, et al.), and is this good for democracy? On the other hand, is democracy better served by relatively penurious politicians who owe office to support by the rich? How can a democratic electoral system be divorced from an aristocracy of wealth?

Politically, the rich have always been very much with us. The signers of the Declaration of Independence, and to an even greater extent, the authors of the Constitution, were largely landed gentry or wealthy merchants. Our early Presidents were all patrician—even Andrew Jackson, symbol of the rough frontier. Abraham Lincoln proved nothing except that the exception proves the rule. True, there was a tendency for the post-Civil War new industrialists to run the country from wherever they were making their money, rather than from Washington. But beginning with Teddy Roosevelt, most White House occupants have again been drawn from the upper economic strata of American society.

The influence of affluence has been noticeable in the Congress, too, and especially in the Senate, once known as the "millionaire's club." Donald R. Matthews, in his *U.S. Senators and Their World,* analyzed the personnel of the Senate for the decade 1947–58. Of the 180 individuals studied, the author found only two who were sons of unskilled workers: Wagner, son of a janitor, and O'Daniel, son of a construction worker. A handful revealed lower-class origins: Margaret Chase Smith, daughter of a barber, and Everett Dirksen, son of a house painter, among others. The "typical" Senator, Matthews found, was white, Protestant, native born of upper-middle-class origins, and college educated for a profession (most often law). "If these are taken as 'requirements,'" he added, "probably less than 5 per cent of Americans have any significant chance of becoming a Senator."

The American democrat who tends to sneer at the British caste system may be astonished to learn that proletarians—miners, steelworkers, carpenters—are a good deal more common in Parliament than in Congress. One reason is that we have no labor party. But more important, perhaps, in an upwardly mobile society such as ours, an individual tends to identify with strata above him, whereas in a more rigidly stratified society he is likely to look to his own class for political representation.

In this country, running for public office is a private enterprise; except in one or two states, tax money does little more than provide boards of elections, polling booths and ballots or voting machines. Like that other waif of the American political system, the political party itself, methods of financing campaigns evolved quite outside the law, and it was not until certain obvious abuses touched the national conscience that regulative legislation was enacted. The fiscal federal statute was adopted in 1867; it protected federal employees against political assessments. Over the next six decades, further laws were passed, and these were finally codified and revised by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925. This Act as amended, together with the Hatch Act of 1939–40, provides the principal ground rules for the raising and spending of money to attain federal elective office.

Unhappily, the regulations regulate nothing, as is indicated in the boxed summary below of the laws and the loopholes. In the view of many experts, such as Herbert E. Alexander, director of the Citizens' Research Foundation, they make a bad situation worse by encouraging cynical disregard for law, increasing the costs of campaigning, failing to broaden the base of political financing, and leading to so complicated a flow of funds from giver to receiver as to deprive both of any assurance that the money always follows its intended channel.

All advertising, whether to sell soup or win office, entails risk; one never knows whether the results justify the expenditures. In political advertising, there is built-in waste. The multiplicity of committees typical of a candidate's campaign multiplies administrative costs without necessarily increasing income. TV, which is eating up more and more of campaign funds, is more often than not a hugely wasteful medium. At least a dozen times, on my home TV, I watched Richard Hughes campaigning for office in 1964, and he rather won me over. But my admiration, so expensively won, did him no good at all; he was running for governor of New Jersey, while I live in Connecticut.

For a Congressional candidate in a metropolitan district TV is so wasteful that it is rarely used; there are forty or more districts within listening range of the major New York City broadcasting stations. But even without broadcasting costs, a Congressional campaign comes high. "One district-wide mailing," says Robert Price, the deputy mayor of New York and a veteran campaign manager, "will cost at least $20,000, including printing and postage. Two brochures—not too much for a four- or five-month campaign—cost another $20,000. If you are lucky, you minimize paid help by getting volunteers; still, there are office rentals, posters, advertising, stationery, phone bills, etc., to pay. The absolute minimum is $50,000." If primary expenses are included, the total may rise to $75,000 or more. That's a lot of money to pay for a $30,000-a-year job with tenure guaranteed for two years only.

How best to spend the money is a big problem; how to raise it is even bigger. "The average Congressional candidate," said Mr. Price, "can expect to get $1,500 from the National Congressional Campaign Committee, another $1,000 from the county committee, and perhaps an additional $1,000 from other party groups. The rest must be raised through solicitation. If he commands a popular following, he can raise a substantial sum from the small contributions of many people through a broadcast or mail appeal. But usually for the bulk of what he needs he must rely on friends, or friends of friends, or labor or business. The biggest givers are likely to be firms with government contracts, or with hopes of getting one; they are what I call the predators—the guys who, if you win, will want something for their money." Mr. Price is on record as stating that, as manager of Lindsay's $2 million-plus mayoralty campaign, he turned down certain large contributions because he thought there were strings attached.

Most campaign managers, and presumably most candidates, are not likely to be that fussy, and the higher and more influential the office sought, the more likely is the contributors' list to be studded with the names of the wealthy. They give directly to party committees, or they buy a page ad in a party pamphlet for $15,000 (until a few months ago, such ads were tax deductible), or they join the President's Club for $1,000, or they pay $100 or more for a "campaign" or "testimonial" dinner (at this writing, Senator Dodd is most anxious to establish before the Senate ethics committee that there is a difference between the two, even if the beneficiary is an incumbent). And not a few are suffused with nonpartisan generosity; in 1964, according to the Citizens' Research Foundation's extensive files, at least eighty individuals gave $500 or more to candidates or committees of both parties.

The real question in all this is not who gives, or how much, but what the giver gets in return. It would be a calumny on our legislators, I trust, and certainly an oversimplification of our politico-economic system, to say that we are governed not so much by the men in office as by the men whose financial support put them there. On any issue, the legislator has many factors to think about other than the interests of his big contributors: his party platform, the wishes of the Administration (particularly if it is of his party), the recommendation of the relevant legislative committee, a voting deal he may have made with a fellow legislator, the rival claims of lobbyists, what he thinks the ordinary people of his constitutency want (in the last analysis, their votes put him into office). There may even be times when he votes his best judgment on what's good for the country.

But history reveals many instances of outright legislative corruption and even more of what appears to be legislative subservience to an industry. There are in Congress today legislators known as "oil men," or "cotton men," or "air industry men," et al. When, as frequently happens, the welfare of a constituency is bound up with the welfare of an industry, the legislator is torn by no divided loyalty. The worst that may be said of him is that he may be betraying consumers elsewhere who can't vote for him—an occupational hazard in our political system, based as it is on sectional representation.

Furthermore, one may ask: Did big money shape the politics of these "industry" men, or was it their politics that attracted the big money in the first place? In 1956, with Eisenhower the candidate, the top men of the American Petroleum Institute made contributions of $500 or more, totaling $171,750—all of it to the GOP. In 1964, with an old Texas hand running on the Democratic ticket, GOP receipts from this source dropped to $48,000, while the Democrats received $24,000. Considering Johnson's regional and economic background, is there any reason to suppose that he would be a less staunch supporter of the oil-depletion allowance if he hadn't received the contribution of $24,000?

None of this means that the big political contributor gets nothing for his money. Is it coincidence that eleven of the nation's top twenty-five defense contractors paid $15,000 each for a page ad in a book put out by the Democrats last year? Is it coincidence that in 1952, of twenty-seven noncareer diplomatic appointments made by Truman, half the ebneficiaries had contributed $500 or more to the Democratic Party, and all were Democrats; and that a year later, of thirty similar appointments made by Eisenhower, twelve of the appointees had given $500 or more to the GOP, and all but one were Republican? At the very least, the big contributor gets what Alexander Heard, chancellor of Vanderbilt University, calls "access" to the decision makers.

There is a final consideration: Does money win? From 1932 to 1942, the Democrats, consistently spending less money, won the Presidency. They have done so again since 1960. The 1960 figures will surprise many. Repeated accusations have been made that the Kennedy family "bought" this election; nevertheless, Citizens' Research Foundation statistics show total reported campaign expenditures at the national level as: Republicans, $11,300,000; Democrats, $10,587,000. In

1964, the GOP outspent the Democrats by one of the biggest margins in history—and certainly lost by the biggest margin.

However, this seeming triumph of ideology over crass money ignores several factors. For one thing, the incumbent usually does not have to spend as much money as the challenger; his "image" has already been projected. Secondly, the figures given do not include pre-nomination (primary or convention) costs, which federal law does not require to be reported. "It is in seeking the nomination," says Robert Price, "that wealth, or access to it, counts most for the candidate. Once he wins the nomination, he already has the attraction of a winner, and he has the party apparatus at his disposal; until then, he is more or less on his own." In this context, it was in Kennedy's primary victory over HUMPHREY in West Virginia, say, that money talked loudest.

The conditions under which political campaigns are financed in this country are indictable on a number of major counts: they (1) breed contempt for law, (2) put a premium on wealth, (3) open the office holder to charges of subservience to his financial backers and (4) fail to encourage widespread citizen participation in the pre-balloting electoral process.

Conditions in the West European democracies are somewhat better, I think. This is not because they have better laws, or their people are more law abiding, but because of the nature of their party structures. All major Left parties are tied to labor; whether you are a Labour candidate in Britain, a Socialist in France, a Social Democrat in Germany or a Communist in Italy, everyone knows that your campaign is being financed by union treasuries. While the Center and Right parties are less well organized, and their fund sources not always so precisely definable, they are equally plainly the creatures of business and industry (and, in some instances, the Church). In Germany and France, various trade and industry organizations have set up central collecting agencies for political funds. In some countries (the Conservative Party in Norway, for example), fixed annual quotas are collected from each business firm or trade association. In any case, membership in a European party, whether of the Right or Left, involves not merely an act of penmanship but some form of financial responsibility.

I do not want to oversimplify the European party system; it has its own complexities. But broadly speaking, party labels on the Continent, at least, mean more than they do here, as regards both politics and the financing thereof.

As long as running for public office in the United States remains a more or less private enterprise, it is difficult to see how its financing can be effectively controlled. Teddy Roosevelt saw this in 1907, and as President suggested that election campaigns be subsidized out of the federal treasury. Nobody liked the idea; no doubt it smelled of socialism. In Europe—and elsewhere abroad—the Socialist devil is thoroughly familiar, and no stigma attaches to borrowing from him occasionally. Thus, partial subsidies of the electoral process are quite common there. Where broadcasting is state owned, parties are given a certain amount of free time, usually in proportion to their voting strength. The French Government prints and distributes campaign circulars and sample ballots in behalf of all candidates, and also pays for election posters; Britain underwrites one free mailing for each candidate. Japan publishes an "electoral gazette" containing objective descriptions of all candidates and their platforms, and underwrites two 4x5-inch newspaper ads for each office seeker. Some West German states (*Laende*) award small but direct cash subsidies to the state party organizations; in some instances, the law requires that the money must be used for "educational purposes" (it almost never is); in other cases, no strings at all are attached.

It remained for Puerto Rico, however, to go almost the whole hog. Under its Election Fund Act of 1957, initiated by Luis Muñoz Marín to rid the country of vote buying and kickbacks from government employees, the national treasury allots each party $75,000 annually in non-election years and (under a 1964 revision of the law) a minimum of $162,500 in election years. The latter sum may be increased, depending upon the number of "straight-ticket" votes the party receives in an election; it cannot, however, be decreased. The allotments are expected to cover the major share of campaign expenses. The law requires a strict accounting of all receipts and expenditures.

In this country, proposals to reform our systems of political financing fall into two schools. Both seek to broaden the base of citizen involvement, to restore public confidence in and increase public respect for the relevant legal regulations, and to increase the opportunities of the poor man to attain office. The difference is that while one school hopes these objectives can be reached in the framework of our "private enterprise" system of fund raising, the more radical school insists that in this field private enterprise simply won't work, and turns to the direct subsidy as a solution.

Typical of the "conservative" school are President Johnson's recent proposals which, like the recommendations of the Kennedy-appointed Commission on Campaign Costs, seek not to change or broaden present political financing methods in any basic way, but simply to control them more effectively. The commission was somewhat more daring than the President, as can be seen by reference to the boxed analysis of the Johnson proposals. Moreover the commission, aware that its recommendations might not prove adequate, suggested that after a trial period they should be subject to revision, with special attention given to a "matching-incentive" system under which private contributions up to perhaps $10 each would be matched by equal contributions from the national treasury.

Plainly, the commission's report was a compromise; its chairman, Professor Heard, has taken a bolder approach elsewhere. While he subscribes to many of the commission proposals, he also urges (1) consideration of payment of cash subsidies to parties and candidates at both state and national levels; (2) government action to reduce TV and radio costs so as to make broadcast opportunities more available for all; and (3) an underwriting by government of some, at least, of the general communications costs of political campaigns.

A year before the Puerto Rican bill was passed, the late Sen. Richard Neuberger (D., Ore.) offered a measure authorizing direct payments from the federal treasury to the national party committee. In a Presidential year, the amount would be 20c per vote based on the average number of votes cast for President in the preceding two elections; in off years, it would be 15c based on the two preceding votes for Congress. In terms of recent elections, this would mean a subsidy of $10 million to $12 million for each party in a Presidential campaign, and $6 million to $7 million each for an off-year campaign.

Aside from affirming the logical principle that running for public office is properly a public enterprise, and therefore should be publicly financed, the subsidy system offers certain specific advantages. It involves every taxpayer in every election, at least financially; it makes the legislator more (or entirely) independent of private interests, and it increases the political opportunity of men without access to wealth. The tendency toward an undue proliferation of small parties which a subsidy system might encourage could be guarded against by adopting the British practice that requires candidates to post deposits which are refundable only if the candidate garners a stipulated number of votes.

Formidable arguments can be raised against the system. Authority goes where money goes, and allotting the subsidies to the national committees makes the state and local organization subservient to Washington. Local Democratic leaders are already restive over the phenomenal success of the President's Club as a money raiser; they see in it not only a drain of money that ought to remain at home, but also an expansion of Presidential authority over the party. Even if the law mandated the sharing of funds with state and local party organizations, on what basis would the eligibility of these organizations be decided? The New York City Democratic organization is torn by a reform movement; would the reform group be entitled to subsidy funds?

Opponents of subsidies raise two further arguments. Will candidates for nomination be subsidized as well as candidates for election? If so, how do you keep out the crackpots who represent no one but themselves? The British system of demanding deposits might work in states where there are primaries; how could it be adapted to the convention or caucus type of nominating procedure? Finally, the opponents say that subsidies would discourage, rather than encourage, citizen involvement in the electoral process; impersonal tax money should not be allowed to replace the individual, voluntary contribution which gives the voter the feeling that he has a personal stake in the campaign.

Perhaps the most singular aspect of the political finance problem is how few people want to do something about a situation that so many admit to be scandalous (many of the charges against Senator DODD could be leveled, with equal plausibility, against other legislators). Many politicians agree that the present system is bad; still, the experts' consensus is that even President Johnson's modest reforms will meet with stout Congressional opposition. Legislators who have managed to win office under existing conditions see little reason to make things better for potential rivals. Nor is there any sign that the American voter is pressing hard for change. Most Americans view politics with considerable skepticism anyway; they expect shenanigans, and whether these occur before or after a man reaches office seems of no great moment.

One can argue plausibly that in a country where money, education and broad social outlook tend to be strongly correlated, it is a good thing that wealth should play an important role in politics. In a better ordered society, of course, no such correlation would exist, and there would be no justification for the advantage that wealth now gives the politician. While we wait for the millennium, some form of subsidy would seem to be in order, if only for the reason that the one-third or one-quarter of Americans who are ill fed, ill housed and ill clothed are also ill represented—or not represented at all—in government. And perhaps, as a start, the funds needed for subsidies could be raised by a turnover tax on the broadcasting, advertising, printing and newspaper industries. They are the industries the money would be spent on in any case.

The Laws and the Loopholes: A Summary of Federal Regulations Affecting the Financing of Political Campaigns—and Why They Don't Work

The Law: No political committee can receive contributions or make expenditures of more than $3 million in any one year. *The Loopholes:* The limits apply only to committees operating in two or more states, and therefore state and local committees are exempt; it permits the creation of any number of interstate committees, each of which may receive or spend up to $3 million a year.

The Law: Every political committee covered by federal statute must report periodically to the Clerk of the House of Representatives the names of all contributors of $100 or more and the names of all persons to whom at least $10 was distributed, together with the totals of all other expenditures. *The Loopholes:* Nobody checks or audits the reports, and you have to go to Washington to see them. They need be kept on file for only two years.

The Law: A candidate for the Senate may spend up to $25,000 and for the House up to $5,000. Each candidate must file, shortly before and again within a month after each election, a statement itemizing each contribution and expenditure made or received by him, or by any person for him, with his knowledge and consent. *The Loopholes:* Note that the law limits expenditures, not contributions receivable. With regard to expenditures, the key phrase is "with his knowledge and consent." The candidate can state that one of his committees put up 100 highway billboards "without his knowledge and consent," and by common consent he can get away with the disclaimer.

Since the candidate is entitled to as committees as he can gather members for, limits to spending disappear entirely. As for reporting, a candidate merely states that all contributions made to him were turned over to a committee for his election. And the committee need not report at all because it is intrastate.

The Law: No national bank, corporation or labor union may contribute to the election, primary, pre-nomination convention or caucus campaign of any candidate for federal elective office. *The Loopholes:* The banned organizations contribute in the name of individuals, or form "educational" or "nonpartisan" organizations which may legally contribute for "bipartisan" purposes. But how "bipartisan" is a COPE get-out-the-vote drive?

The Law: No government contractor may contribute during the negotiations for, or the life of, the contract. *The Loophole:* The president (or secretary or treasurer) of the firm makes the contribution.

The Law: No individual may contribute more than $5,000 to any one candidate or committee during the calendar year. *The Loophole:* But there is nothing to stop the individual from making unlimited $5,000 gifts to as many candidates and committees as he likes.

Note: *No limitations of any kind are placed on the personal receipts or expenditures of candidates for President and Vice President, nor are they required to make any financial report to anyone.*

The President's Proposals: An Analysis of His Suggestions for a Federal Election Reform Act

Proposal: All gifts exceeding $100 received by federal legislators, and all income from personal services received by them or on their behalf, are to be reported annually, with appropriate criminal sanctions to be provided for failure to comply. *Critique:* A highly desirable piece of legislation timed, no doubt, to relieve the Democratic Party of some of the pressures upon it generated by the charges against Sen. Thomas E. Dodd (D., Conn.).

Proposal: Every candidate for federal office, as well as every committee—state as well as interstate or national—that supports a candidate would be required to report all contributions and expense items that exceed $100. For the first time, the disclosure provisions would include candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, and also all fund raising and spending in pre-election campaigns (primaries and convention nominations). *Critique:* While plugging many loopholes in present law, the proposal is weakened by two factors. First, its lack of definition of a "committee" would require, presumably, that a handful of high school youngsters who collected $100.29 for a favored candidate would have to report. Under such conditions, disclosures could prove so massive as to be indigestible. The proposal's second weakness aggravates this difficulty: it fails to set up adequate machinery for receiving and processing the reports.

Proposal: Present ceilings on total expenditures by candidates for federal office would be repealed and the total contribution coming from any single source to the campaign of any candidate would be limited to $5,000. *Critique:* All experts would agree on the repeal of present ceilings. Since they are unenforceable, they simply encourage cynical disregard of law. The $5,000 suggested limitation, if adequately enforced, would go a long way toward plugging the scandalous leaks in present law. However, it could not prevent the determined Democrat (or Republican) giver from contributing $5,000 each to as many candidates as he wished.

Proposal: The present law preventing corporations with government contracts from making contributions to federal campaigns should be extended to cover state and local campaigns. *Critique:* A sound broadening of present law, but it leaves untouched a major loophole in the field: corporations, banks and labor unions, all of which are ostensibly barred by present law from political contributions, can still contribute through their individual officers.

Proposal: Individual contributors could deduct from taxable income each year the first $100 of their contributions. *Critique:* As a possible alternative to an income-deduction plan, a Kennedy Commission on Campaign Costs recommended a flat tax credit of half the contribution up to a maximum of $10 a year. As between the two schemes, the flat tax credit is clearly preferable. Under the income-deduction system, the wealthy are favored; i.e., to a person in the 25 per cent income tax bracket, a $100 contribution would cost $75, while to a richer man in the 75 per cent bracket, it would cost only $25.

Proposal: The only item permitted for sale by a candidate or committee would be campaign souvenirs at no more than $5 each. *Critique:* In 1964, the Democrats charged $15,000 for 1-page ads in their convention publication; if the President's proposal is enacted into law, the Republicans won't be able to follow suit.

Mr. Speaker, while I do not agree with some of the references and some of the inferences in the above article, I agree with most, and that is why I want to add my voice in favor of an early study of the President's suggestions for a Federal Election Reform Act. I am certain that when the House has worked its will on the proposed legislation a step in the right direction will have been taken.

Captive Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week is a yearly reminder to the world of the hundreds of millions of unfortunate people of central and eastern Europe. Repressed in action, they still strive for freedom of thought and expression. Their dignity and courage are a spur to all freemen.

In this Congress, I have introduced a resolution which would establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Such a committee would inquire into means by which the United States can assist, through peaceful process, the people of these nations in their just aspirations to regain individual and national freedom. On the observance of this 8th annual Captive Nations Week, let us reaffirm our great concern for all nations subjugated by totalitarianism.

New Rules Needed in Public Utility Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues and readers of the Record an interesting editorial in the July 15 edition of the Maryville-Alcoa Daily Times, published by Mr. Tutt S. Bradford, in Maryville, Tenn. Since our entire Nation has been affected by the current airline strike, I feel that this article is worthy of special notice by Members of Congress:

New Rules Needed in Public Utility Disputes

Along with most of the flying public, we were greatly relieved by the CAB ruling the other airlines could maintain and operate the planes of those lines struck by the International Association of Machinists. This does, however, still place a great hardship on the public, many of whom depended upon the public transportation as a means of conducting their business.

This particular labor situation apparently is boiling itself down to personalities with various people getting riled up and walking out of conferences. Management had refused to negotiate with the union because the union had abrogated a status quo contract in spite of assurances otherwise and the union broke off talks by marching out of the meeting, stating that the airlines broke faith.

In the meantime, the public which both are dedicated to serve with scheduled transportation is being severely penalized by the inability of each party to the dispute of accomplishing their appointed tasks. Management is supposed to be able to negotiate in good faith with the union and union leaders are selected to negotiate with the management. Both are failing their responsibility, not only to the people they represent but to the public-at-large.

Once again this points up the need for further legislation into the realm of public utility labor problems. When the government issues a protective veil over an industry from a competitive standpoint by issuing authorizations for service to the public which only they can serve in this manner, the actions of those who ignore the public while taking advantage of the monopolistic factors in their business should be curtailed.

Authorizations to serve the airline routes are given to airlines as certificates of necessity, the public welfare demanding this. Labor and management problems do not stop this public necessity for the public still needs the service in spite of the disputes. Still we cannot deny anyone the right to strike, the right to walk off their job when they feel they are getting a raw deal, when they want to search elsewhere for better work.

Public necessity, however, demands that public transportation, public utilities and other privately owned and quasi-public utilities be made to conform to more stringent labor regulations in return for the governmental protection of their interests. Before their service to the public can be terminated, a set of regulations such as a 90 day cooling-off period, a secret ballot on the last offer of management among union members and other steps for both management and labor to conform should be established.

During this cooling off period, the government should step in and set up procedures with other companies who would take over the services being performed by the public utility. Equipment of the idle company should be available but neither striking personnel nor management should participate in the emergency proceedings in order to bring both to normal conversations around the bargaining table.

The public then would still be served but the rights of the workers to strike would be protected. Both management and labor would be penalized for their failure to achieve accord with the pressure on each to perform his job as quickly as possible.

The time has come for Congress to recognize the rights of the public in this field.

Congressman John E. Fogarty, Brain Research Foundation, Drake Hotel, Chicago, Ill., June 2, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY, BRAIN RESEARCH FOUNDATION, DRAKE HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., JUNE 2, 1966

When I received Mr. Linck's invitation to speak to you this evening I was particularly pleased, for several reasons. For one, I hold voluntary health organizations such as yours in very high regard. Over a period of twenty-five years as a Member of Congress, I have shared in the tremendous excitement of the growing medical research movement, and have been in a particularly privileged position to observe the role and importance of voluntary health groups in backing up the Federal side of the program. The tireless efforts of your officers and volunteers, in serving on our advisory committees, testifying as citizens before Congress, promoting the whole national movement in a thousand ways, have had an immense effect in making the Federal medical research program both popular and successful. And from overshadowing your efforts, we have helped you too, as the growth statistics amply show. We are partners in the greatest battle in history—the battle for human health.

Another reason why I was pleased to come was because the occasion offers a chance to meet some of the nation's leaders in brain research, and to think with you for a few minutes about this especially fascinating and challenging part of medical research. The miracle of the brain and nervous system to me exceeds that of any other part of the body.

And the challenge is not so much understanding of the miracle itself, but the goals of brain research—solution of the problems of the neurological and sensory diseases. We are sometimes inclined to relegate neurological diseases to a minor position because of the importance of heart disease and cancer as public health problems. But when we group them together, we find that they are responsible for a major share of all deaths, disability, and suffering.

I would like to dwell this evening on that part of the nation's effort in brain research with which I am most familiar—the Federal program as administered through the National Institutes of Health, and more specifically, the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness.

As many of you know, this Institute has been in existence since 1950; it has grown with the other Institutes at NIH; it has an appropriation in the range of $100 million annually, most of which is devoted to grants and awards for the support of neurological research and research training in universities, hospitals and other institutions throughout the country, with most of the remainder supporting intramural research, both basic and clinical, in Bethesda, Maryland. The Institute has had a strong impact upon the field generally, both in increasing the amount of research going on, and in encouraging people to enter the field, but the needs are still many times what can be accommodated. As a simple example, there are still less than 2,000 neurologists in the United States, with estimates of more than 10,000,000 people suffering from neurological illnesses. There are large areas of the country which remain hundreds of miles from a hospital large enough to have a neurology department. Institute training programs have been steadily increased, they could be doubled and still not meet the need.

There are a number of areas in the NINDB program upon which Dr. Shannon, Dr. Masland, and their staffs are attempting to focus interest and in which activity is being stimulated.

BRAIN INJURY

An important neurological concern that is demanding increasing national attention is the problem of accidental brain injury. We have data showing that accidents are the major cause of death during the productive years from birth to the age of 44. Over 100,000 people are killed annually in accidents. Approximately 70 percent of these deaths are from head injury, according to our best estimates. Hospital records show that approximately 1.3 million people suffer at least temporary disability from head injury, and that 130,000 a year have serious permanent disabilities.

The conflict in Viet Nam and the alarming rise in brain injuries from auto accidents point up the significance of this problem. NINDB is approaching the problem in a number of ways. One of these is the support of research projects such as that of Dr. Joseph P. Evans here at the University of Chicago. Dr. Evans and his group, I understand, are conducting a laboratory and clinical study of head injury which includes an exploration with the electron microscope of the many changes which take place in brain tissue as a result of the internal swelling caused by a blow on the head. They are also evaluating current forms of treatment, and attempting to develop better methods of handling these cases.

Some of you were probably aware of the NIH-supported head injury conference held here in February. This produced a highly valuable set of recommendations outlining needs in the epidemiology, diagnosis, and therapy of head injury, and calling for the creation of clinical research centers patterned after those already in existence in many other problem areas. The conferees were some of the most knowledgeable people in the world in this field, and proceedings, which we had incorporated into the NIH appropriation hearings in March, should be of substantial help in stimulating wider interest.

Our concern here is not limited to the early stages of the head injury reaction, or to adults, but extends also to the effects which are detected later, and to the brain-injured child. Many individuals whose initial injury seems trivial have a subsequent relapse due to swelling of the brain. And in about 10 percent of the cases of mental retardation, the disorder results from some post-natal event. To better coordinate the attack on the problems of the brain-injured child, NINDB has organized three task forces. One is devoting itself to definition of the problem, which ranges from cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and gross intellectual defect to what is classified as minimal brain dysfunction. A second is studying the medical and educational services needed for these children. This task force is sponsored by the Neurological and Sensory Disease Service Program of the Public Health Service, the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, and the U.S. Office of Education. Task Force III will outline the scientific research necessary for solution of the problem. In addition to the task forces, a collaborative research project is in process of being organized, with the aim of evaluating the effectiveness of various forms of treatment. These efforts at coordination and providing guidance while not as glamorous are, of course, just as essential as the actual scientific work in the laboratories and the training support in the schools.

STROKE

Another major neurological disease area, in which the Federal Government, through NIH, has begun a big "push," is stroke. Coupled with the overall research training program of NINDB, including neurology, neuropathology, neurosurgery, and the many other disciplines needed, there has been a program of research grant support in cerebrovascular disease for many years. This, however, has been pathetically inadequate, considering the extent of the problem, and the program has been accelerated, reflecting the great interest and concern during the last several years of both the Congress and the President.

One of the major developments has been establishments, through grants from NINDB, of a group of broad-based, multidisciplinary research centers where patients can be studied by experts, and various aspects of this complex disease investigated. Three of these stroke research centers, located at Minneapolis, New York City, and Detroit, were begun in 1961; five more, in Miami, Durham, Baltimore, Boston, and Philadelphia, were funded in 1965; and grants for two others, in Rochester, Minnesota, and Winston Salem, were just awarded in March of this year, bringing the total to ten. Each of these centers has a major area of emphasis within the stroke field: examples are mechanisms of blood clotting; dynamics of blood flow; the pathology and chemistry of the cerebral vessels; speech difficulties following a stroke; epidemiology; and general problems of diagnosis and treatment. As you can see, these centers are presently concentrated in the East, for the reason that resources and interest have been rather heavily concentrated there. I understand, however, that a number of grant applications from scientists in midwestern and western population centers have been received, and we are hoping that this distribution can be improved within the next year or two, so that we will have a base for training of research and service personnel throughout the country, as well as a vital research resource. These centers can become an important component of the evolving regional medical programs for heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

In addition to the expansion of the stroke centers program, several new types of training support, both direct and institutional, are now available from NIH, for clinical study. Clinical training grants and clinical traineeships are now providing short term training opportunities to medical practitioners who want to learn from experts the latest developments in stroke diagnosis, prevention, and treatment. Since most physicians cannot leave their practices for very long, some of these traineeships may be awarded for periods as short as six weeks. As soon as the training courses can be set up in the hospitals, these traineeships will begin to move us toward our goal of bringing the latest advances in care to the remotest villages and hamlets of America.

At the apex of the Federal stroke research program is a Joint Council Subcommittee on Cerebrovascular Disease, consisting of members of the national advisory councils of the Heart and Neurology Institutes who have special skills and experience in this field. This subcommittee has to its credit some remarkable achievements, the chief one being coordination of the whole national program through recommendations to the Councils.

EPILEPSY

Epilepsy is another of the major areas of our Federal neurological research program. There are estimated to be between one and two million victims of epilepsy in the United States. There is no known cure and treatment is largely through anticonvulsant drugs. More than 50 percent can now have their seizures controlled through anticonvulsants but for many the answer has not been found. A large part of the program relates to fundamental research on the basic mechanisms. Two epilepsy research centers, similar to those I mentioned in the stroke field, are being supported through grants. In one, at the University of Washington, neurophysiologists, neuroanatomists, neuropharmacologists, and behavioral scientists are pooling their talents in long-term basic studies; in the other, at the University of Wisconsin, new drugs are being evaluated, using electroencephalography, and other approaches. Part of the UCLA Brain Research Institute program is devoted to mechanisms of epilepsy, and at the Neuropharmacology Research Center at the University of Utah, anticonvulsant mechanisms are under scrutiny. In addition to these, there are some 80 other NINDB-supported research projects, as well as an intramural program in Bethesda including patient studies and studies of artifically induced epilepsy in animals.

For purposes of improving national coordination and encouragement of the epilepsy research effort, a Public Health Service Advisory Committee on the Epilepsies was just officially announced by Surgeon General Stewart about three weeks ago. This committee is being chaired by Dr. H. Houston Merritt, dean of Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons, and also codiscoverer of the well-known anticonvulsant drug, Dilantin. Other members are persons of national prominence in the field, and I know they will make an important contribution.

PARKINSON'S DISEASE AND MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

Another area in which the NINDB is attempting to focus greater research interest is that of the so-called degenerative diseases of the nervous system, including Parkinson's disease, and multiple sclerosis. There are again afflictions for which medical science has little to offer. In Parkinsonism, drugs, physical therapy, and surgery offer three ways of possibly alleviating some of the crippling symptoms. Drugs can provide 25 to 50 percent control of the rigidity, tremor, and lethargy. Intensive physical therapy can bring patients from 50 percent to 75 percent of normal, under ideal conditions. Surgery, although widely publicized, is a more limited possibility, because only 10 to 12 percent of all victims are suitable subjects, and because, usually, patients over 65 are not helped by surgery. The picture for these people is discouraging, but there are some hopeful developments. One, of course, is the growth of the program, both Federal and voluntary.

The NIH research grant and intramural programs range broadly from clinical studies with patients to basic investigations of the physiology, biochemistry, and metabolism of brain centers and muscle groups involved in motor control. The Neurology Institute's biggest programming effort of the past several years has been establishment and support of a Parkinson's Disease Information and Research Center at Columbia University. Here scientists are making electron microscopic studies of brain tissue from Parkinson patients taken at autopsy, and analyses of the neurohormones, enzymes, and other substances making up the metabolic chain which, when properly functioning, preserve balance in the nervous system, and which appears to be deficient in some cases, in the brain tissues of Parkinson patients.

In multiple sclerosis, there is no effective treatment that can be offered the patient, in spite of an extensive research program for years. This disease produces disintegration of the myelin sheathing nerves in the brain and spinal cord. It afflicts about a quarter of a million Americans between 20 and 40. A good portion of the Federal program in MS is devoted to exploration of the theory that the cause may be a slow virus—one which may be carried for as many as 10 years before the symptoms develop. A particularly interesting research study on this is underway in Israel. It has been known for a long time that the incidence of MS is much greater in colder climates than in warm climates. In fact, the disease is almost non-existent in the tropics. Before the influx of many peoples to Israel, the disease was almost nonexistent there. Now, however, the incidence has risen considerably and the cases are found among those peoples migrating from Europe rather than the Afro-Asian countries. Additionally, it has been found that many do not show symptoms until a number of years after they have come to Israel.

Pursuing the viral theory, NINDB is supporting substantial work at its Patuxent Research Center at Laurel, Maryland, on slow animal viruses causing neurological diseases resembling multiple sclerosis. But this is just one approach; to mention a few others, NIH and grantee scientists are studying autoimmunity, the abnormal process causing the body to reject, or develop antibodies to certain of its own tissues; they are studying the chemistry of demyelination, and, in collaboration with the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, they are treating nerve cell cultures with specimens taken from the blood and and spinal fluid of MS patients to see if these patients carry myelin-destroying substances in their own bodies.

What may be a very important development in slow virus research just took place this year when scientists succeeded in transmitting kuru, a rare neurologic disorder somewhat related to Parkinson's disease and MS, from man to chimpanzees. This opens up tremendous possibilities for the study of processes that could not be observed in human patients.

CONCLUSION

This is far from being a comprehensive summary of the broad Federal program of research in the diseases of the brain and nervous system. I am simply attempting to highlight some of the areas in which progress is being made. We, of course, think in terms of larger sums and programs than is possible for even the largest of the voluntary health organizations, but I would like to stress again that this doesn't make the job you people are doing any less important. It is probably more important, because of the immensely crucial public acceptance you help to secure for the whole movement. Voluntary agencies, such as the Brain Research Foundation and the Federal Government are each concentrating their resources where they will do the most good in a complementary and highly effective effort. There are still oceans to span—and unexplored continents. Most of the neurological diseases are still unconquered. But we have a magnificent movement underway in this country, and all of us here tonight are part of it. Let us hope that it continues to grow.

Cash Before Beauty at Grand Canyon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, in the July 3 edition of the Washington Post, Mr. Irston R. Barnes, chairman of the Audubon Naturalist Society, presented most accurately the argument against the construction of two dams in the Grand Canyon region of our Nation.

I believe a better course of action for the 89th Congress would be to approve my bill, H.R. 15072, and other identical measures, which would greatly expand the size of the Grand Canyon National Park. I believe the grandeur of this region should be a part of our national park system where it will remain in its natural state for the enjoyment of future generations.

CASH BEFORE BEAUTY AT GRAND CANYON?

(By Irston R. Barnes)

Many Americans are puzzled: with a forthright leader of the New Conservation in the White House and a highly articulate spokesman for natural and wilderness values as Secretary of the Interior, how is it possible for the Bureau of Reclamation to be promoting two new dams on the edges of Grand Canyon National Park, Marble Gorge, above the park, and Bridge Canyon, below. The lower dam will back up water into the park and require construction within it.

Both dams will drown out 130 miles of some of the finest scenery in the Grand Canyon. They will, by impounding its waters, kill the Colorado River as a living geologic force.

Neither dam will serve a public or economic purpose. Indeed, the Bureau of Reclamation wants to "borrow" a billion-odd dollars, at less than the interest cost to the Treasury, to be repaid out of revenues after completing payments on the Hoover, Parker and Davis dams!

Both new dams are a part of the Bureau's power projects. They are not to conserve water. Instead, they will increase evaporation losses by enough to supply both Phoenix and Tucson.

The Bureau's Rube Goldberg stunt is to generate electric power and use the revenues to finance pumping water to Arizona from an existing reservoir and to reimburse southern California by bringing water from the Columbia River.

Unfortunately for the Bureau's antiquarian economics, before the existing Glen Canyon dam (now only half full) and the new dams can begin producing electricity, equivalent power from cheaper sources will be available. So the Bureau's "cash register dams" (its own designation) would destroy the living Colorado, its priceless scenery, waste water in a water deficit region, and misuse public funds at vast cost to the taxpayers.

The proposal is now before Congress in the Lower Colorado River Development Act (H.R. 4671) and Rep. ASPINALL'S House Interior Committee is expected to move soon to bring the bill to a vote. The two dams should be eliminated from it.

Even though the Administration's decision should be easy in principle, it will be difficult politically without public support. You, the public, can kill this proposal by communicating with your Senators and Representatives. It also would help to write to Interior Secretary Stewart Udall and President Johnson.

Even though the new dams would have their sites outside the present boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park, the grandeur of the canyon in these reaches dictates that these areas should be incorporated into the park with additional areas along the North Rim.

We Need a Nuclear Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the public wants a nuclear Navy as a protection for the United States against its very active enemies. In this connection, I hope that the Secretary of Defense will not oppose the American people and their elected Representatives in the Congress.

For both the Senate and House in the $17 billion defense procurement bill recently passed have agreed that $130.5 million of the funds available for Navy shipbuilding in the current fiscal year "is authorized only" for construction of a nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate. Secretary McNamara's refusal to use this sum for a frigate would mean that he is against a nuclear Navy.

In this connection, by unanimous consent, I introduce an article which gives some true facts about the nuclear frigate provided for by Congress:

WE NEED A NUCLEAR NAVY

(By Louis Stockstill)

The development of a nuclear-powered surface Navy may hinge on the Administration's reaction to an important proviso which has been appended to the fiscal 1967 military procurement authorization bill.

Just before Congress departed Washington for a 10-day summer recess, House and Senate conferees agreed to language in the $17-billion procurement bill which provides that $130.5-million of the funds available for Naval shipbuilding in the current fiscal year "is authorized only" for the construction of a nuclear powered guided missile frigate (authorized last year) and $20-million "is authorized only" for procurement of long leadtime items for an additional nuclear frigate.

The proviso stipulates that the contract for the frigate authorized last year "shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President full advises the Congress that its construction is not in the national interest."

By refusing to build the first of the two frigates and by rejecting a Navy request for funds for the second such ship (even though it was accorded the second-highest priority in the overall shipbuilding program by the Chief of Naval Operations), the Department of Defense acted on the basis of cost-effectiveness studies which the Navy has challenged and, we think, discounted. Obviously, Congress agrees.

In turning down the Navy requests, Secretary of Defense McNamara initially contended that he had never been furnished with an adequate Navy rationale for nuclear power in escort vessels. Subsequently, however, CNO Admiral David McDonald presented the Secretary with a comprehensive memorandum on the subject which made some hard-hitting points.

The data in the McDonald memorandum showed that for a one-third increase in overall cost the Navy could obtain a nuclear frigate (instead of a conventional destroyer) which would have (1) twice the number of missile launchers and missile magazines (2) helicopter landing facilities not available on the destroyer, (3) facilities and accommodations for a screen commander, which the destroyer does not have, (4) more complete Naval Tactical Data System facilities, (5) twice as many torpedo tubes, and (6) all the advantages of nuclear power.

Admiral H. G. Rickover pointed out in his Congressional testimony on the subject that fuel also was an important cost-comparison factor discussed in the CNO memorandum. The initial nuclear cores for two frigates (good for ten years) would cost $24-million. Regular fuel for two conventional destroyers for the same time period would cost $12-million, but an additional $26-million would have to be extended on delivery of the oil.

We feel that the Navy has made a solid case, particularly in light of the statement in Admiral McDonald's memorandum that "The endurance, tactical flexibility, and greater freedom from logistics support of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled Naval striking force. Our new warships, which the Navy will be operating into the 21st century, should be provided with the most modern propulsion plants available. To do less is to degrade effectiveness with grave implications for national security."

The Role of Agriculture in Achieving Peace on Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Glenn H. Beck, vice president for agriculture at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans., has recently emphasized the role which agriculture and the people trained in this field, will play in bringing peace to the family of nations. His observations have been summarized in a news release from the office of university news at Kansas State University.

With the importance which the Congress is placing upon food for peace and food for freedom, I feel that it is particularly apropos for my colleagues to know about Dr. Beck's comments. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing this news story in the Appendix of the RECORD, and respectfully recommend it to the Members of Congress:

MANHATTAN, July 18.—The hope for peace on earth will rest more, in the almost immediate future, with agricultural graduates than with graduates in any other field.

That is the opinion of Dr. Glenn H. Beck, vice president for agriculture at Kansas State University, Manhattan, who is administratively responsible for agricultural college staffs in India and Nigeria and who recently has studied and observed food production problems in those and many other foreign countries. Eliminating hunger is a prerequisite to stable governments, and stable governments are a prerequisite to peace, he explained.

Developing nations especially need crops and soils specialists to increase food production and to release their citizens from peasant-type agriculture for education and industrial development. Many developing nations still are using more than 75 per cent of their labor force in food production—often at below subsistence levels, Dr. Beck said.

The supply of well trained agronomists is woefully inadequate to meet present demands. The Agency for International Development, the Foreign Extension Service, foreign governments, the U.S. State Department, foreign industries and U.S. industries with foreign businesses all are seeking graduates of agricultural curricula to help increase food production in many of the countries where food shortages are the government's number one problem.

Agricultural colleges need curricula and professors to inspire young Americans to help export agricultural know-how, Dr. Beck says. Internationally oriented agricultural options should be available at the undergraduate level and students should be encouraged to take the courses as undergraduates. Graduate programs that prepare students for foreign service have been developed by many U.S. colleges of agriculture, but the KSU vice president for agriculture thinks too few undergraduates recognize how great opportunities are for service and employment abroad.

Beck thinks no classroom experience can teach an understanding and appreciation of world food problems as well as service abroad. Neither can classroom experience give so keen an understanding and appreciation of other cultures.

There is great demand in foreign countries for persons trained in crops, soils, agricultural engineering, irrigation, entomology, plant pathology, animal sciences and economics. Beck said persons trained to increase food production are so scarce that land-grant universities cannot begin to meet the demands for men needed now, except by pirating from each other, which doesn't increase the supply one person.

In the tropical and subtropical areas, where plant diseases and insects are not regulated by freezing, entomologists and plant pathologists are needed to meet year-round problems. Much of Latin America, Africa and Asia (countries with the most hunger) is tropical or subtropical. Every developing foreign country needs economists to help it develop marketing institutions, sources of credit, and to teach farm management principles, Dr. Beck points out.

Despite the dense human populations of underdeveloped nations, many such countries still have vast areas that can produce nothing but forages, Beck said. It takes animals, usually ruminants, to convert the forages to food (protein) so opportunities for persons interested in livestock production also are greater than ever before in history.

Beck's office recently has been asked by International Voluntary Services, Inc., to help find 45 men for agricultural development work in Vietnam, Laos and Algeria. Four recent requests from the U.S. Department of State asked for help in finding persons with advanced degrees in agriculture to work in various Agency for International

Development missions in Latin American countries at salaries from $12,500 to $22,900. Such positions are going begging now for lack of applicants, Beck said. Yet the need for them is increasing as people in nearly all countries realize that wars settle no basic problems such as hunger.

However, the K-State vice president does not recommend training for work abroad because the pay is good.

The kind of students needed, and the kind Kansas State University's College of Agriculture wants, he emphasized, are those motivated for service—those who want to help their fellow man. Agricultural training for service in developing nations has no peer.

Many persons in no way connected to agriculture now agree that the basic need of nations trying to develop industrially and politically is more efficient food production, Dr. Beck said. Such awareness of the problem means it will be easier to solve. Historically it previously has been considered unsolvable.

Address of the Honorable Durward G. Hall, Before the Missouri Rural Letter Carriers Association, Springfield, Mo., July 8, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention and to the attention of the Members of this body, an excellent address by one of our colleagues, the Honorable DURWARD G. HALL, of Missouri. Congressman HALL, who has had a longstanding interest in the welfare of our Government workers, addressed the Missouri Rural Letter Carriers Association in Springfield, Mo. I join with our colleague when he says he is proud of the tremendous job our rural letter carriers are doing.

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN DURWARD HALL, MISSOURI RURAL LETTER CARRIERS ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, JULY 8, 1966, SPRINGFIELD, MO.

It's indeed a pleasure to have the opportunity to address the Missouri Convention of the Missouri Rural Letter Carriers Association, to welcome you not only to Springfield, but also to this 7th Congressional District. I hope you'll come often and stay late to enjoy our Ozarks hospitality. I think particular congratulations are in order to your State president, Harry Thompson, who has the responsibility of presiding over this convention.

We here in the 7th district are especially proud that one of our own, Floyd Huffman, from Flemington, has had the distinction and the honor of serving as national president of your great association.

I had an opportunity to read the June issue of the Missiuri Rural Carrier and to read of Floyd's interest throughout his career in the affairs of your State and national organization. The story I read said that this was a proper place to show your appreciation for the long hours, many sleepless nights and thousands of miles traveled by Floyd on your behalf. I can personally vouch for the fact that many of those hours have been spent in my Washington office keeping me informed of the legislative matters in which you have an interest, briefing me on some of your problems, as well as the problems of the Nation in seeing that the mail gets delivered, and always doing these things in his courteous and understanding way that's so typical of Floyd's personality. I don't think your organization could have had a better man to represent you on Capitol Hill?

While Floyd has been briefing me so much, I welcome this opportunity to brief you and to advise you of the status of some of the legislation in which you have an interest. I checked with my office in Washington today, and with the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee just to be sure we were up to date.

I know you're all interested in the pay bill, and let me say here that I think a word of appreciation is due to you and the letter carriers in general, because in your efforts to reach comparability you demonstrated responsibility, and I might even add statesmanship, in recognizing the tremendous demands on the Federal Budget resulting from our involvement in Vietnam, and in tailoring your requests to meet this situation. I'm not a strong exponent of compulsory guidelines, but this certainly is a period when restraint is needed by all segments of the economy, and you have measured up to that need perhaps better than most groups and organizations.

I'm sure you're wondering, along with me, why the pay ball isn't over on the President's desk awaiting his signature.

I'm sure I don't have to tell this knowledgeable group that it takes both the House and the Senate to enact legislation. We've done our part, about 2 months ago, in fact, but there seems to be some kind of delay going on in that other body. As you know, the rules of comity prevail between the House and Senate, and we never say harsh words about the other. I don't know who comes out ahead under this arrangement, but I think maybe they do.

Now, one of the reasons, I understand, for the delay in the other body was a fear that the Bureau of the Budget didn't like the July 1st effective date we inserted in the House. That's the beginning of the fiscal year and we thought it both prudent and wise to do so.

I can report to you that effective date remains July 1 and there was no change made by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I'm adivsed that the pay bill will be the first order of business when the Senate reconvenes next week.

One of the other provisions of the bill which I'm confident will not be changed permits retirement at age 55 after 30 years of service or age 60 after 20 years service.

Also, for the first time there is a mandatory annual uniform allowance of $125 a year, and an increase in automobile allowances on special delivery calls.

The Rural Letter Carriers Association has always been a working organization, working always to provide a better service to those in the community in which you live. Yours is an honorable career, and I especially concur in the purpose of your organization as published in the National Rural Carrier magazine which comes to my office regularly. . . . . "To improve the methods used by rural mail carriers, to cooperate with the Post Office Department and the public for the good of the service, to promote a fraternal spirit among members of the association, and to benefit their conditions of labor."

You, the rural carriers, have an excellent opportunity to lead the way for all postal employees in the execution of an outstanding customer service program. You are the principal contact and in many instances, the only contact for over one fifth of the country's population with the postal service.

No other position in the postal service can be looked upon in quite the same perspective as a rural carrier. You are both clerk and distributor, carrier and collector, educator and emissary, and I'm sure, in many instances, confidant and postal chaplain to your customers!

I'm sure there isn't a rural carrier who hasn't been unduly detained while a customer expands on his pet theory for the postal service or offers his solution to all the problems facing the postal service.

I know this often presents a problem in trying to maintain your daily schedules and still take the time to discuss a particular problem with one of your constituents—if I can use that term—as it applies not to me but to you.

Yet, I'm sure you know that suggestions and inquiries from patrons are often a forerunner of customer complaints, and occasionaly I, too, hear from those who think they know what's needed to speed up the delivery of mail. I'm happy to say that I don't get many such complaints from your routes here in the 7th District.

I think the postal service has found that some of the best suggestions for improved service comes from the carrier themselves, for you're at the grass roots location where the problems are noticed.

We in the legislative branch are also vitally interested in ways to improve service and sometimes we can see that a good suggestion is brought to the attention of those who have the direct responsibility of managing the Post Office Department. I may not always be able to see that your suggestions are followed, but I usually can insure that it will be given serious consideration.

I want to stress again that I'm proud of the work you are doing and the calibre of the people that are here today, good fine patriotic Americans, the salt of the earth, people with a dedication to their country, to their job, and to their fellow man who are so vitally dependent on the service you render.

I find in reviewing the annual report of the Postmaster General for last year that there are in Missouri 1,346 rural routes involving a total mileage of almost 81,000 miles. That's a lot of driving, a lot of walking, and a lot of responsibility, and I know there are a lot of good men here today who will see that it's carried out to the best of their ability. I know you will continue to work together with the Congress for a progressively improved postal service to which our 190 million fellow Americans are justly entitled, and I want you to know that in the future, as in the past, I am always anxious to work with you on every matter in which we have a mutual concern. Thanks for the opportunity to be with you this afternoon, and to show my personal appreciation for the good works you are doing.

Physical Fitness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, we, as a nation, have become more aware of the importance of physical fitness. Industry recognizes its importance by spending over $1 billion for employee recreation programs.

In 1956, President Dwight Eisenhower recognized the need of a coordinated plan for the improvement of the physical fitness of our youth and by Executive order created a Council of Youth Fitness. In 1961, President John Kennedy reorganized this Council so that its interest became that of the adult as well as that of youth. Mr. Stan Musial is the present head of the Council.

Now known as the President's Council on Physical Fitness, it has had the full support of President Johnson who has said:

> The fitness of our Nation for the tasks of our times can never be greater than the general physical fitness of our citizens.

In the past, we have concentrated very heavily on the major sports of football and baseball. These are great sports but not all of our citizens can participate in them. I would call your attention to a less publicized athletic activity—the game of squash.

A short time ago, I noted a very interesting squash tournament held at the University Club here in Washington. No one could question that this sport in which people of all ages could play, would add to our physical fitness.

The tournament was organized by Peter Gaynor, Bill Wilson, and the club professional, Henry Goodheart.

I am certain that those young and mature people who watched Charles Ufford, of New York, defeat Deihl Mateer, of Philadelphia, in the finals or watched Blair Sadler defeat Bill Morris in the consolation match, would be encouraged to become players and thus improve their physical fitness.

I mention this as an encouragement to all people to search out some of our less publicized sports so that they might find one that meets their needs. In this way, we can truly be a part of our national physical fitness program.

Reclamation Is Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, in a recent town hall speech in Los Angeles, Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy pointed out that reclamation is conservation in a very real sense, something which is sometimes not understood or is overlooked a half century after this very important program was initiated by the Congress.

Commissioner Dominy paid special tribute to one of our most respected colleagues, Congressman MICHAEL J. "MIKE" KIRWAN. In his address, the Commissioner pointed out that Congressman KIRWAN worked as a day laborer and roustabout in the construction of the Mulholland Tunnel long before he came to Congress, and thoroughly understands how important reclamation is to the national economy.

With increased emphasis being placed today on conservation of the Nation's natural resources, I commend to the attention of all Members of the House the remarks of Commissioner Dominy before the Los Angeles audience:

RECLAMATION IS CONSERVATION

(Address by Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, before the Los Angeles, Calif., town hall meeting on June 28, 1966)

It was a timely invitation which brought me before this Town Hall audience today. A great debate is building up on the manner of preservation, conservation and use of our publicly owned natural resources and the Pacific Southwest is sitting squarely in the center of the argument.

Consequently, it is appropriate that I select this opportunity to offer some remarks that I have been contemplating for some time.

I don't need to tell anyone here that neither Los Angeles nor any other metropolitan area of the Pacific Southwest would be in existence today at their present size and scale if man had not taken some positive steps to correct nature's imbalance of natural resources.

Some people question whether or not this is a good thing. I have read some letters to the editors criticizing your State's and our federally developed cooperative plans on the lower Colorado, which infer it would have been much better if Los Angeles and Phoenix and all the vast sun country in between had been allowed to be just that, sun country and nothing more. But from the fact that you seem to be happy and pleased to be living here, I would judge that you disagree, as I do.

Consequently, I am very proud that our Bureau of Reclamation, placed in business by the Congress back in 1902 under a great conservation President, Theodore Roosevelt, has been a major cooperator with the States of the Pacific Southwest in the development of essential water supplies.

Our role in the early Reclamation development in Arizona, through the Yuma and Salt River projects, is well known. What is not so well known is that when your predecessors here in Los Angeles were scratching around seeking an additional water supply in those same early years of this century, it was the Bureau of Reclamation which found a suitable reservoir site from whence developed the Owens Valley Project. That project was developed by your own local government, which is as it should be, wherever possible. I am a hearty believer in the philosophy that the Federal Government should undertake only those things which local people and local governments cannot undertake for themselves.

I also take some vicarious pleasure in the fact that one of the best Reclamationists we have today worked as a day laborer and roustabout in the construction of the Mulholland tunnel. He is MIKE KIRWAN, now a Congressman from Ohio and Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works.

He is one of the most solid friends and supporters Reclamation has, because he knows what the Bureau of Reclamation has accomplished and how important its mission here in the Western States is to our national economy. He knows, as well as anyone, that Reclamation *is* conservation.

I emphasize that little word, *is*, because I believe it to be true. Reclamation is conservation. It is the kind of conservation that helped lay the groundwork for the historic Conference of Governors on Conservation of Natural Resources in 1908. It is entirely in keeping with the declaration that came out of that conference and which inspired the past half century of unparalleled advancement in conservation.

"We agree that the land should be so used that erosion and soil-wash shall cease," formally declared the assembled Governors; "that there should be reclamation of arid and semiarid regions by means of irrigation, and of swamp and overflowed regions by means of drainage; that the waters should be so conserved and used as to promote navigation, to enable the arid regions to be reclaimed by irrigation, and to develop power in the interests of the People; that the forests which regulate our rivers, support our industries and promote the fertility and productiveness of the soil should be preserved and perpetuated; that the minerals found so abundantly beneath the surface should be so used as to prolong their utility; that the beauty, healthfulness and habitability of our country should be preserved and increased; that the sources of national wealth exist for the benefit of the People and that monopoly thereof should not be tolerated."

The Bureau of Reclamation has lived up to this credo within the framework of its responsibilities and the West and the Nation are richer for the work we have been able to accomplish in a cooperative effort with the Western States and their people. Nevertheless, today we are being branded as "destroyers" in critical $25 books and expensive full-page newspaper advertisements. The Congress is receiving a flow of emotional letters, canned postcards, and prepared coupons, most of which clearly stem from the unprincipled and erroneous allegation that we are "flooding out" the Grand Canyon and ruining the National Park System.

Let's take a look first at what Reclamation has accomplished. It may help in determining whether we are destroyers.

Your own growing metropolis outstripped the Owens Valley water supply and started looking for new sources in the 1920's. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California was organized in 1928 and authorized to build another great water lifeline, turning this time to the Colorado River. This project, the Colorado River Aqueduct, was made possible by the Bureau of Reclamation's construction of Hoover Dam, a massive concrete plug which harnessed the Nation's most erratic river. Moving quickly against the threat of new water shortages, the Metropolitan Water District advanced funds to the Bureau of Reclamation to build Parker Dam, an after bay dam below Hoover, and in the mid-1930's started construction of the giant pumping plant and aqueduct to bring Colorado River water across mountains and desert to Los Angeles and San Diego. The American Society of Civil Engineers designated this aqueduct and Hoover Dam as two of the seven engineering wonders of America. But I suppose we and you both are destroyers because these great engineering works were built in the natural serenity of the desert.

And while we were all busy on the Colorado River, the Bureau of Reclamation also was working elsewhere in the West, so much so that a new productive area, equivalent in size to Connecticut and Delaware, has been added to the assets of the Nation. Of course we have altered a lot of desert land, but there are nine million acres of a lush irrigated greenbelt where before there was only desert land or drought threatened cropland. You who prize your irrigated suburban greenery be the judge as to whether we are destroyers.

In addition to water for irrigation, Reclamation projects deliver in excess of 500 billion gallons of water annually to municipalities and industrial areas—serving a population of more than 10 million. Hydroelectric power, produced as a by-product of the stored agricultural and municipal water, is now being generated at a level of 38 billion kilowatt-hours annually—enough to supply the residential needs of a city of 6 million. This hydroelectric production, incidentally, does not pollute the air and it conserves valuable fossil fuels.

The Bureau of Reclamation has completed nearly 200 storage dams in the West. These impoundments have a storage capacity for

127 million acre-feet (more than 41 trillion gallons) of water. This stored water is cool, clear, and sparkling after the sediment settles out, in stark contrast to its muddy, roily state when it is imounded as it flowed to the sea in the natural rivers during and after the spring snowmelt. In addition to a major flood prevention and flood control role, these man-made lakes provide water-oriented recreation to millions—more than 35 million days of visitor use last year by fishermen, boating enthusiasts, campers, and others.

But of course, we are destroyers because we regulate the rivers and streams, clean them up and keep them flowing year around, without ruinous seasonal floods or the slim trickles of the dry months.

Construction is now at the half-way point on a third—500-mile-long—water supply line for this area. This is the California State Water Project. The Bureau of Reclamation is proud to be associated with the State of California in one of the key reservoir and canal sections of this great water system, the jointly constructed San Luis Dam and Canal on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley.

The Feather River water will take care of the needs of Southern California until about 1990. But the far-sighted officials of the Metropolitan Water District and the State of California and the Bureau of Reclamation are already actively seeking to assure the additional water for continued growth and development for the 21st Century.

The vehicle for this new future water supply for southern California along with Arizona and Nevada, is one of the most far-reaching resource developments ever proposed. This is the Colorado River Basin Plan, a seven-State proposal that has evolved during the past three years out of the long-planned Central Arizona Project.

Much credit for broadening the Central Arizona Project legislation into a regional water plan goes to Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and to Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. In 1962, Chairman ASPINALL wrote to the Secretary seeking his views on a coordinated comprehensive pattern for development of the water and power needs of the entire Pacific Southwest. Secretary Udall responded in January 1963 with an announcement of the start of a new study for the Lower Colorado River Basin Plan, aimed at solving the growing water and power problems of the Pacific Southwest.

This proposed plan, wrote Secretary Udall, "erases the outmoded concept limited by State lines, and concentrates on meeting the total water needs of a region. In the parched Pacific Southwest, we can prosper together or slowly shrivel separately."

As a result, a massive assault had been launched against threatening water shortages for the driest and fastest-growing region in the United States. And, parenthetically, a simultaneous attack has been mounted against the Bureau of Reclamation as the "great destroyer."

By August of 1962, a planning report had been completed by the Bureau of Reclamation on the proposed Pacific Southwest Water Plan. It was submitted to the States and interested Federal agencies for review, and legislation subsequently was introduced in the Congress. Sponsors of this regional legislation were members of the Arizona and California Congressional delegations—for the first time in history united behind a water resource development proposal affecting the Colorado River and all the States that look to it for their water lifeline.

Subsequently, the proposal became known as the Lower Colorado River Basin Project and it won qualified approval by the Administration prior to House hearings in the fall of 1965.

But there was still room for further regional expansion in a heartening display of water statesmanship. At the 1965 House hearings, members of the Congress from the Upper Colorado River Basin States had expressed concern about the effect of this downriver project upon future developments contemplated upstream, and they had pointed to the need for additional water in the upper basin by 1990. Accordingly, agreement were hammered out in a series of meetings last winter involving Congressional representatives and water officials of the seven States. Out of these eventful meetings emerged a basinwide project, supported, also for the first time in history, by all seven States of the Colorado River Basin.

This expanded legislation now proposes immediate authorization and construction of the Central Arizona Project. Other water supply projects in the Basin would be authorized also. In addition, if would establish a regional development fund to finance future projects to augment the inadequate water supply of the Colorado River. These future projects—desalination, weather modification, and/or importation from water surplus areas—would be determined in a feasibility study to be completed within three years, according to the proposed legislation. The general objective of the feasibility studies would be to augment the Colorado River water supply by some 2½ to 6½ million acre-feet—the latter amount being equivalent of another river nearly half the size of the persent Colorado, which today is totally committed to consumptive uses or long-term storage.

Simultaneously, there is before the Congress a proposal for a national water supply study commission. While detailed research is pressed in desalination and a practical effort is being made to put known principles of weather modification to use in developing an additional water supply, there must be a complete array of facts and figures on water needs, supplies and potential surpluses in the various river basins. Only when these data are in and comparative costs are available, can Congress be expected to act on far-reaching proposals to augment the water supplies in areas of shortage.

Perhaps even more significant than the agreement on the terms of the Lower Colorado River legislation is the fact that the seven States of the Colorado River Basin are now working collectively, with the Federal Government, to solve the most pressing, largest, and most complex water supply challenge of our times. This unity of purpose is vital if the most arid part of the Nation is to enter the 21st Century without facing a water supply ceiling, limiting further economic and population expansion.

Associated with this Colorado River development during the past six decades in the seven basin States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, have been other noteworthy resource activities under Federal-State auspices. These include such major undertakings as the development of the Salt and Gila rivers in Arizona, the $2 billion Central Valley Project in California, major transmountain diversions to the Rio Grande, Arkansas, North Platte rivers and to the Great Basin in Utah, and headwater development in the Missouri River Basin in Wyoming. Collectively, the Federal-State water resource development in this seven-State area is the largest and most successful water use effort in the world. The existing projects are now a world-renowned demonstration area for arid zone resource conservation and utilization—and will be for many generations to come. Yet we are accused of being destroyers.

This sketchy resume of water resource development in the Colorado River Basin States is intended to remind you of this area's stake in this program. I again suggest to you that Reclamation is Conservation.

In spite of this background, those of us who have given our careers to water resource conservation and development have been attacked in recent months by massive propaganda and lobbying campaigns, in the name of conservation, which appear directed at discrediting and undermining the Reclamation program.

Consider these sweeping charges and glittering propagandistic generalities used by sincere but misguided preservationists against Reclamation during consideration of the Lower Colorado River Project Bill:

Blind planning; faulty arithmetic; threatening the National Park System; wasting water; stretch facts beyond the breaking point; selling a bill of goods; a boondoggle; shaky economic underpinnings; obsolete precepts; hydroelectric power outmoded; reclamation laws no longer appropriate.

These people, carried away by their single-purpose zeal, have failed to recognize the great grey area between total preservation and total development, neither of which is contemplated.

As an example of the scare tactics used to achieve their emotional purpose, the following statement is made in an article in a conservation magazine, later digested in a mass circulation magazine:

> "Much of the Grand Canyon habitat of the desert bighorn sheep would be destroyed by Bridge Canyon Dam."

Since my agency had originally proposed this structure, I sought information from the Federal agency which has jurisdiction over such wildlife, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

This is an excerpt from that Bureau's reply:

> "Bighorns known to be in Bridge Canyon Reservoir area, but extent of population little known because of inaccessibility. If bighorns are in fact in Marble Canyon, population would be very limited. There are known populations above Bridge Canyon Reservoir in Grand Canyon National Park and in Lake Mead area (Black Mountains) below damsite. Bighorns have no particular affinity to river bottom except possibly for watering purposes. They normally range above the valley floor. At Havasu Lake (behind Reclamation's Parker Dam) bighorn populations adjacent to lake have increased in the years since impoundment, and they are commonly seen by boaters on the lake. At this year's Bighorn Council meeting, a Utah game department biologist gave a paper concerning apparent recent increase in bighorn populations adjacent to Lake Powell (Glen Canyon) reservoir."

Hence, the *facts* appear to be that Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs have actually increased the population of desert bighorns. But propagandists have deliberately distorted or misrepresented the facts and the vaunted editorial review of one of the world's largest circulation magazines apparently accepted this false statement on its face.

A principal impression the preservation propagandists seek to foster in generating their emotional appeal, is that the reservoirs proposed in the original Southwest Water Plan would "flood out" the Grand Canyon and thereby ruin the National Park System.

The Marble Canyon damsite is located 12½ miles above and outside the upstream boundary of the Park and dam and reservoir would be totally outside of either Park or Monument. The proposed Bridge Canyon Dam, which is in the area-sponsored legislation, but which the Administration has recommended be deferred for further study, is downstream on the Colorado River from both the Grand Canyon National Park and Monument. It would, however, back water in the inner gorge of the Grand Canyon through the National Monument and for 13 miles alongside the boundary of Grand Canyon National Park.

The preservationists have failed to point out that in our efforts to "flood out and destroy the Grand Canyon"—and those are their quotes, not mine—that the same vista from any viewpoint along the rim within the National Park will be visible without change when either or both reservoirs are created.

There are accusations that Marble Canyon Dam will affect the regimen of the river through the canyon. But the regimen was changed when Glen Canyon Dam was built and as a result, there is much clearer and colder water flowing downstream. There is now an excellent trout fishery below the dam where none existed before. It is true that there are power fluctuations but the minimum flow is greater than the natural flow in years of low runoff and the power discharges can help get the river runners through the rapids.

In sum total, the river running season has been extended from a single uncertain month in periods of high runoff, to several months as the result of construction of Glen Canyon Dam. The situation will be improved even more in future years when Lake Powell is higher.

We and the Congress have been bombarded with accusations that the dams are unnecessary to the project, that hydropower is outmoded and will soon be replaced by great thermal generating plants. We have analyzed all of these counter proposals thoroughly and in good faith. Yet, we find them wanting.

For example, the low-cost kilowatts which would come from these new thermal plants are predicated upon high load factor operation which is economically feasible only with a supplementary source of peaking energy such as hydro can supply. We also are aware that the utility industry still contemplates investment of many millions of dollars in hydro facilities, something that would be highly unlikely if hydro is going out of style.

Or their arguments have been that there are alternative means of financing Reclamation development. But such ideas have found a singular lack of practical support in Congress. Thermal or nuclear power alternatives to either or both of these dams are not options open to consideration under present Congressional thinking or experience.

Nevertheless, because we operate within a framework which has been laid down by the Congress in carrying out our water development responsibilities, we are not conservationists but destroyers, in the image these groups are seeking to build up. I say the contrary is true, that Reclamation development which gives full consideration of all existing values and all benefits which will be created, is the real conservation as Teddy Roosevelt and the other broad conservationists who have followed him have repeatedly endorsed.

Our critics have even sought to usurp the image of this great conservationist when they quote President Theodore Roosevelt, as he stood on the south rim of the Grand Canyon in 1903:

"Leave it as it is. You cannot improve on it. The ages have been at work on it and man can only mar it."

Congress took him at his word and incorporated all of the Grand Canyon, as far as the eye could see from his viewpoint and much farther in each direction, in Grand Canyon National Park. And you today, and your children, and your children's children, will be able to see the magnificent vistas Theodore Roosevelt viewed, unchanged, even when Reclamation's task is completed.

Who is to say what Theodore Roosevelt was thinking when he stood on the rim of the Grand Canyon. What was he thinking of when he wrote:

"It is becoming clear that our streams should be considered and conserved as great natural resources. . . . The time has come for merging local projects and uses of the inland waters in a comprehensive plan designed for the benefit of the entire country . . . . It is not possible to properly frame so large a plan . . . without taking account of the orderly development of other natural resources."

This has been a guiding policy of the Bureau of Reclamation through the years and more so now than ever before. The competitive demands of a growing population, a growing economy and vastly greater leisure time and travel convenience, make the careful planning and use of our natural resources of greatest importance.

I am a veteran of 33 years experience in the Federal career service, all of it in natural resources administration and am familiar with the President's record in conservation since his days as a young Congressman, back in the 1930's when my own career was just getting underway.

He and Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall are down in my book as solid conservationists. I am convinced they both have at heart the definition Gifford Pinchot and his aides used so much, that conservation is "the use of the natural resources for the greatest good for the greatest number."

President Johnson is beset with international problems, but nevertheless, he keeps a firm hand on the resources picture, with Secretary Udall at his able and forceful lieutenant. Indicative is the recent transfer of the pollution control administration to the Department of the Interior. It reflects the President's same judgment and confidence in Secretary Udall that we all share who work with him.

Such belittling and ill-advised references as have recently been made about him are in poorest taste and judgment when balanced against his overwhelming record of accomplishment in the public interest. They reflect the panic of those critics who refuse to recognize that Reclamation is Conservation.

Celebrate in 1976

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Denver Post regards the joint resolution signed by President Johnson to create a commission to plan a celebration for the 200th anniversary of the birth of our independence as a sensible approach to a significant event.

But the newspaper offers a valuable suggestion.

The Declaration of Independence can best be commemorated by completing a number of unfinished tasks by 1976, the Post contends.

For instance, we can cleanse our air and rivers, beautify our cities and countryside, and enrich our cultural life. We can wipe out slums, conquer poverty, secure peace, and enable more of our people to share in the blessings of our country.

Then the bicentennial will have far greater meaning.

This is an appeal for concerted action that I would like to place in the RECORD:

MORE TO CELEBRATE IN 1976

President Johnson, like many of his predecessors in the White House, has been influenced by a deep sense of history and has acted with history in mind.

The President demonstrated this again last week in handling a joint congressional resolution setting up the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission to plan the national celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of American independence.

It was natural enough that the President should sign the bill on July 4, the date of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. That is when the President did sign it.

But, in order to involve some extra history, Mr. Johnson postponed announcing that he had signed it until July 8, the anniversary of the ringing of the Liberty Bell, proclaiming "liberty throughout all the land."

Whenever and however it was signed, the bill represents a sensible and useful approach to an important national event, which is now only 10 years away.

The Bicentennial Commission will be composed of four senators, four representatives, nine federal officials and 17 private citizens.

Their assignment is a challenging one, for the nation will not only be commemorating an event on July 4, 1976. It will also be rededicating itself to a set of ideals.

It will be asserting that, despite the changes of two centuries, the old principles still hold good, the old ideas still work, the old course is still a sound one.

This rededication and this assertion deserve an appropriate ceremony. But the birth of independence in this country can best be commemorated through a series of unfinished national tasks which can be brought to completion by 1976.

If we can cleanse our air and our rivers, beautify our cities and our countryside, expand and enrich our cultural life, wipe out slums, conquer poverty, secure peace and enable more of our people to share in the privileges and blessings of this country, the bicentennial ceremony will have far greater meaning.

We have 10 years to do it in. While the Bicentennial Commission is at work planning the celebration, the rest of the nation can be busy as well seeing to it that there is more to celebrate.

McNamara Hit on "Paper" Savings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article by Mr. Mike Miller, Scripps-Howard staff writer, appeared in the July 18 Washington Daily News. I would like to place in the RECORD this discussion of Defense Secretary McNamara's cost-reduction program:

HOUSE PROBES CLAIM: MCNAMARA HIT ON "PAPER" SAVINGS

(By Mike Miller)

Robert S. McNamara constantly recites the instructions he received from the late President Kennedy on being named Defense Secretary.

Mr. Kennedy told him to build a military second to none, but to do so at the lowest possible cost.

And that, says Mr. McNamara, is still his philosophy—sacrifice nothing in national security while refusing willingly to spend one dime more than necessary to provide the required readiness.

Mr. Kennedy's first orders to Mr. McNamara are the basis of the Defense Secretary's widely acclaimed cost reduction program, which Mr. McNamara contends saved the taxpayers $4.5 billion during the past fiscal year.

His goal is an annual saving of $6.1 billion by fiscal 1968.

DISSENT

But even in claiming to give the taxpayers a break Mr. McNamara is controversial.

A house sub-committee is now investigating his cost reduction program amid charges that some savings Mr. McNamara claims are "phony"—on paper only, rather than money in the treasury.

A quip being told around the Pentagon sums up much of the criticism. Mr. McNamara's son, the story goes, came home and announced that he had saved 25 cents.

"Instead of riding the bus, I ran home beside it," the boy said.

"That's great," replied Mr. McNamara. "Tomorrow save $1.50. Run home beside a taxi."

Mr. McNamara acknowledges that there is no Defense Department surplus of $4.5 billion because of the cost reduction program. But he says that to have the same military readiness the U.S. enjoyed last year would have cost $4.5 billion more without it.

His critics in Congress and elsewhere reply that it is every Federal bureaucrat's duty to cut costs where possible and live within his budget. Mr. McNamara is no exception, but he makes more noise about money saved, they say.

The critics challenge Mr. McNamara even on a 40-cent bolt for helicopter armor. Mr. McNamara said the bolt was substituted for a more sophisticated one which costs $34 each. So far $13,104 has been saved.

Skeptics question why a $34 bolt was used in the first place if a 40-cent one is sufficient. They would chalk the price difference of the more expensive bolt up to waste rather than savings.

Paying and Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, property ownership as a criterion for voting eligibility has, for all practical purposes, disappeared from the American scene. I suppose that one who were to advocate the restoration of that test would, in today's vernacular, be branded as an extremist.

I suppose it is likewise true that just a few years ago anyone who seriously advocated a guaranteed annual income, with the guaranteed income to come from the Federal Treasury, would be branded as an extremist.

Loyal Meek, chief editorial writer of the Milwaukee Sentinel, has shocked a number of his readers by proposing serious consideration of limiting the right to vote in national elections to citizens who pay personal Federal income taxes. Extreme, reactionary, 18th-century thinking? Maybe so, but if these adjectives apply to Mr. Meek's provocative suggestiton, should not the same adjectives be used to characterize the guaranteed annual income proposal?

The editorial referred to follows:

PAYING AND VOTING

Why not limit the right to vote in national elections to citizens who pay personal federal income taxes?

In the face of the current emphasis on extending and loosening voting qualifications, this proposal may appear to be a drastic step away from democracy.

It is not, however, as restrictive and discriminatory as it might appear at first glance. The vast majority of present American voters are federal income tax payers.

Linking the privilege of voting with the payment of income taxes would be logical and just. It would give those who support the government the right to pick who is to operate the government. It would exclude dependents from voting. He who pays the piper will call the tune. Revolutionary as it may sound, this proposal deserves serious consideration. It is none too soon to begin. A movement is under way to establish a guaranteed annual income—according to current standards, about $3,000 a year for a family of four. The money would come from the federal treasury, which would get it from the taxpayers.

Will it be proper for those who receive free incomes to have the vote for president or for senators and representatives? This would be the reverse of taxation without representation. It would be representation without taxation, which would be just as wrong.

Taking the vote away from those who are dependent on the government would be a form of penalty. But what would be wrong with that? It might serve as an incentive for some to stay off or to get off the guaranteed income rolls. Those left on the dependent rolls, without the right to vote, would not become the prey of politicians more interested in buying their votes than in their welfare.

Tying the vote with the payment of federal individual income taxes would have many ramifications. It would upset the present arbitrary and varied age limits for voting. Children would, with few exceptions, remain without the vote.

A considerable number of elderly people might lose their right to vote upon reaching that stage where they no longer have to pay federal income taxes.

Young people, upon nearing maturity, could be encouraged to become full fledged citizens by seeing the possibility of earning the right to vote well before they reach their 21st birthday.

As a practical matter, the vote would probable have to go to every person who filed a return, individually or jointly, whether he or she ends up paying anything or not—just so the individual doesn't get back more than he or she paid in. After all, the government did have the use of their refund money for a time.

Most importantly, we believe, relating the right to vote with the duty of paying income taxes would be the best and surest way to put the prime responsibility of democratic citizenship where it belongs—in the hands of the responsible citizens.

This would tend to produce the most responsible government, to the benefit of everybody, including all voteless dependents.

Capitol Improvements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following editorial from the Elizabethton, Tenn., Star as it expresses its views on the proposal to provide a new west front for the Capitol:

LET THE CAPITOL ALONE

It would be nice, no doubt, for tourists to dine in the nation's capitol, improving their time the while by gazing out upon the memorials to Washington and Lincoln. Doubtless, all things considered, it would be a fine thing to give members of Congress another 109 offices to add to those they now have in five office buildings nearby. It might even be argued that additional committee and conference rooms, not to mention movie auditoriums, would be a fine addition to the capitol.

But would these rather questionable needs justify adding a bulging shell of white marble to the west front, thus destroying the historic facade and terrace? We think not.

If space is needed for yet more congressional offices and conference rooms, it can be found elsewhere. That goes double for tourist restaurants. The sandstone west front wall should be repaired—and then left alone.

"Open Mouth" Controls a Conspicuous Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Detroit News for July 18 is a significant one. Entitled "Open Mouth Controls a Conspicuous Failure," it points up the obvious fact that economic stability cannot be achieved by political announcements.

The continued increase in the cost of living, brought about by the inflationary policies of the Johnson administration, works a serious hardship on all our people especially those living on fixed income.

As the editorial points out, fiscal restraints are essential if we are to escape an additional increase in the cost of living or greater Federal taxation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial:

"OPEN MOUTH" CONTROLS A CONSPICUOUS FAILURE

The headlines tell the tale: "Government Wins a Price Rollback for Molybdenum," and "Congress Urged to Curb Rising Rates of Interest." The nation is witnessing an era of economic manipulation by "open mouth" policy and ad hoc controls. It is economics of the absurd, and the public will ultimately pay for Washington's folly.

Price increases have been rolled back for steel, copper and aluminum, and they have been modified for newsprint and shoes. Some intended price increases have faded away, as in the case of cigarets. But none of this has been done on any systematic basis or with a legislative mandate. Instead, the threat of government power or the critical tone of highly placed officials has been responsible.

Yet for every price selectively shouted down, two or three others escape notice and creep upward. Controlling specific prices in a period of generally rising prices is as futile as carrying water in a sieve. And, of course, selective wage controls are no better. Limiting wage gains in "conspicuous" industries does not solve the problem of rising wages elsewhere.

The attempt to curb interest rates by legislation is another piece of economic chicanery. Denied the support of fiscal measures to limit demand in our full-employment economy, the monetary authorities have had to rely on tight credit to dampen the boom. The administration, applauding the action in private, publicly rails against rising interest rates as though they were the unnecessary result of an ulterior plot.

High interest rates are the price of scarce money, and this scarcity is currently the major bulwark against runaway inflation. To clamp controls of interest rates thwarts the purpose of tight monetary policy and penalizes the savers whose very act of saving fights inflation.

Is it possible that Washington is economically illiterate, or that it is advised by incompetents? We think not. We think every point made here is thoroughly understood, but shunted aside in favor of more politically palatable devices.

The most dangerous part of Washington's "jawbone economics" is that the public may believe that pronouncements can, in fact, solve economic problems. And, in this belief, the public may tolerate half-way measures while inflationary pressures continue to mount. Ultimately, Washington will have to impose full monetary and fiscal restraints in a larger corrective dose than would be needed now. Washington will have to do even more fast talking to explain that to the weary taxpayer.

Good News From Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Rusk was cautious in weighing the recent hint from Red China that it would not intervene in the Vietnamese war.

So is the Chicago Daily News, but the newspaper suggests it adds to growing evidence that communism and Chinese influence are on the wane in Asia.

The News refers in an editorial to a recent dispatch from Keyes Beech, its correspondent in Asia, reporting that from all along the periphery of Red China things are looking up for our side. Mr. Beech is convinced this trend could not have occurred except for the strong U.S. stand in Vietnam.

I offer the editorial for the RECORD:

GOOD NEWS FROM ASIA

Reading significance into the output of Peking's propaganda mills is a risky enterprise. Sec. of State Dean Rusk was appropriately wary in weighing the hint from Red China that it would not intervene directly in the war in Viet Nam.

But if the editorial in the official People's Daily of Peking meant what it said, another piece of good news can be added to the others coming out of Asia. The editorial said that Peking would continue to give support to the North Vietnamese, but added that "people should and can rely only on themselves to make revolution and wage people's war in their own country, since these are their own affairs."

The implication seems clear enough: The Red Chinese are willing to fight the war in Viet Nam down to the last Vietnamese. But as long as it's a "revolution" and not an attack on China itself, encouragement and tools are all the Vietnamese will get from China.

Coming as it does after the U.S. attacks on oil dumps near the heart of Hanoi and Haiphong, the statement tends to reduce the fears that heavier American commitments in the area would bring China into the war. And while we hope such reassurance will not contribute to needless American escalation of the war, it adds to the growing evidence that communism and Chinese influence have passed their peak and are on the wane in Asia.

Our correspondent Keyes Beech, reporting from Thailand, rounded up the case for such a belief on Monday. He cited the turnabout in Indonesia from a pro-Communist to an anti-Communist stance, the ousting of a pro-Communist foreign minister in Pakistan and a growing disenchantment with Communist ideas and power elsewhere in Asia.

A seasoned observer of the Asian scene, Beech is not given to wishful thinking. He has in the past filed copy from his beat that fairly dripped gloom. Now he says that "from Korea to Karachi, all along the sprawling periphery of Red China, things are looking up for our side."

The turnaround could not have occurred, Beech believes, except for the United States' strong stand in Viet Nam, for it is the presence of American power there that is giving the Asian nations the courage to develop in their own way and not Red China's way.

Obviously, there is a long road ahead in Asia before true stability can be attained. But the word out of Asia's capitals—now including the word out of Peking—is more encouraging than it has been for some time.

Herschel Newsom's War on Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE H. HAMILTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an excellent article describing one Hoosier's personal war on hunger in the world.

That man is Herschel Newsom, master of the National Grange; chairman of the Committee on the World Food Crisis, and trustee of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation.

Mr. Newsom, who comes from the rich farmlands of Bartholomew County in Indiana, has brought with him to Washington that particular wit and wisdom of the Hoosier farmer.

I am especially proud of Mr. Newsom's outstanding work in the effort to erase starvation from the face of the earth. And I am pleased to submit Mr. Newsom's commentary on the war on hunger as it appeared in the July 7, 1966 edition of the Columbus Evening Republican:

SWORDS INTO PLOWSHARES: NEWSOM'S WAR ON HUNGER

(By John Rutherford)

A former Bartholomew county farmer who now lives in Washington, D.C., is the leader of a movement aimed at marshaling forces for an international "war on hunger."

"We live today in a world of strange and baffling paradoxes," says Herschel Newsom, who left the Azalia community where he still owns land to become master of the National Grange.

"We know more about how to produce and prepare high-quality food for maximum nutritional value than at any other time in history; yet we have the bleak prospect that many people will starve to death this year, and the prospects for adequate diet for the rapidly expanding population will become increasingly dim."

Since Dec. 9, Mr. Newsom has been chairman of the Committee on the World Food Crisis, formed that day to spearhead efforts to stamp out starvation.

Subsequently, he has conferred with U.S. and Asian officials over an Indian food crisis; testified before congressional committees; conferred with British Prime Minister Harold Wilson, and met with President Johnson's assistants to give them his views.

A BUSY MAN

He also is president of International Federation of Agricultural Producers and a trustee of the American Freedom-From-Hunger foundation.

In testimony before a U.S. House committee studying problems of world hunger and appropriate U.S. response, Mr. Newsom explained his views at length.

"The United States," he said, "cannot forever exist in alliance with its friendly and affluent international neighbors as an island of abundance in a sea of despair. The very survival of our much heralded and highly valued Western civilization and the validity of the professions of Christian culture are dependent upon our ability to successfully meet the challenge of world hunger."

His solution:

"Since our objective is a peaceful and prosperous world in which there is security for political systems and persons, where the differentiation between the hungry and the well-fed is eliminated, where the fear of pestilence and death is removed from the weak and strong alike, where famine stalks his prey with devastating effects no more, indeed, where the lion and the lamb shall lie down together and men shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks—then we must mobilize the total productive resources of the developing and food-deficit areas of the world simultaneously with an expansion of the productive capacity of the United States."

LACK PROGRAM

He says that in the Western nations, the best techniques of food distribution have been developed in all history "yet a substantial part of the world is hungry simply because there exists no marketing and transportation organization adequate to move foodstuffs into the food-deficit areas."

He said nations with a long-time record of surplus production in agricultural commodities have slipped behind the Iron and Bamboo curtains and for the foreseeable future have become food deficit areas and "the block over which they stumbled was agriculture."

"Today," he says, "the great subcontinent of India is in political distress and threatens to be pushed into the Communist orbit along with all of southeast Asia because of the political problems that come from hungry people."

Turning to Scripture, Mr. Newsom remarked:

"Thus, the truth of the statement of the prophet Isaiah is verified when he said, 'And it shall come to pass that, when they shall be be hungry, they shall fret themselves, and curse their king and their God'—Isaiah 8:21."

NOT ENOUGH

Mr. Newsom notes that the U.S. has had a food-for-peace program for the past decade and while it has done much good it has not been enough.

"Food relief and production problems are so vast," he says on this point, "that the United States should not presume to meet these obligations alone. The fact that they would become permanent objects of our charity is not so disturbing as the fact of their failure to develop their own agriculture and, consequently, their own economy."

How would all this affect American agriculture?

"The prosperity of American agriculture does not, and must not depend on the expansion of relief markets, but rather on the development of commercial markets in the rest of the world," says Mr. Newsom.

He does not want the war-on-hunger, food-for-freedom or similar slogans to be an excuse for removing all U.S. government farm programs.

"Programs to remove the restraints on our production and to transfer the costs of the agricultural programs to relief programs would serve only to reduce the income of American farmers and to seriously impair the opportunities which may be developing in the emerging nations for their agriculture to become a viable part of a growing and prosperous economy," he said.

Mr. Newsom outlines a 3-step priority program:

1. "Our first priority is to prevent as far as possible any mass starvation in any country of the world."
2. "Another priority must be in the development of commercial markets."
3. "A third priority must be development of the agricultural production in the less-developed countries, for use by such countries."

"A major opportunity for multi-lateral action," he said, "is offered in the development and administration of programs to improve nutrition for children, reduce illiteracy, improve per-acre production of essential crops, provide for long-term credit and low-interest loans, finance and staff regional research facilities, develop transportation, storage and marketing facilities, and so forth. The scientific and technical know-how of the developed countries must be fully utilized in these programs and, in the meantime, the necessary dietary supplements and additional food supplies should be made available . . ."

Speaking as president of the international food producers association, he said:

"We believe that the time is at hand when it must be recognized that the piecemeal and uncoordinated application of the productive resources of the developed world is not sufficient to meet the commitments of resources which will be required for the solution of the problems we are considering here today. With all due respect for the pronouncement of the Secretary General of the United Nations, the appeals of Pope Paul, the statements of the World Council of Churches and other international bodies, the fact remains that we simply are not marshaling our forces in any unified way to solve these trenmendous problems."

He issues this call:

"For attainment of our ultimate objective, we must advance all of our forces for victory on a total front. Great salients of unresolved areas cannot be permitted to remain, if the overall goals of food production and nutrition are to be accomplished."

Mr. Newsom sums up his concern in the following words:

"We know more about nutrition for both humans and animals than ever before . . . yet two-thirds of the world suffers from malnutrition, and in some parts of the world, over half the babies born die before they reach school age because of ingrowing crops by the use of herbicides for weed control, yet much of the productive land of the world is unusable because of the rank growth of vegetation choking our food.

"We know how to protect our crops.

"We know much about protecting our growing and stored food from insects. Yet the food productive capacity of the developing world is severely limited by plagues of food-destroying worms and insects.

"We know how to protect our stored grain from damage due to weather and atmospheric conditions, yet the lack of storage capacity which can accomplish these same objectives in the food-deficit areas is a major factor in the lack of food where it is needed.

"We know how to protect stored food from rodents, yet we read with dismay that in the hungriest nation of the world—India—half of the food grown is either destroyed or made unfit for human consumption by losses due to rodents.

"We know how to educate yet the world is illiterate.

"We know how to control population, but population continues to expand at an explosive rate.

"We know how to control disease, but disease is rampant."

"In short, we know how to feed the world . . . (yet) . . . the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse—pestilence, war, famine and death—continue to stalk the world. Although they may emerge at different times from different doors, they come from the same barn."

Hon. Wood T. Brookshire and Hon. Louis Morgan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial concerning the successes of Mr. T. Brookshire and his family and Mr. Louis Morgan. I know these people well. I subscribe wholly to this editorial which appeared Wednesday afternoon, July 13, 1966, in the Longview Daily News:

[From the Longview Daily News, July 13, 1966]

THEIR DREAMS CAME TRUE

Any city in East Texas would be excited over the prospects of securing a new industry with 130 to 140 full-time employees and 25 to 35 part-time workers.

We have the equivalent of such an industry in the four Brookshire Food Stores, which represent an investment of well over $1,250,000.

They are here because of the vision, courage and faith of a man who has built the largest independent business organization of its kind in East Texas.

Wood T. Brookshire, whom we are privileged to have had as a friend nearly 33 years, is one of the most successful businessmen in Texas and a legendary figure in the food and merchandising fields. His manifold achievements cannot be ascribed to luck. They are the end result of ambition, desire, drive, determination, perseverance, ability and abiding faith. Coupled with these attributes is an innate high quality of leadership that automatically springs from a quick, sharp and perceptive mind.

A fine, Christian man himself, Wood Brookshire always has been able to surround himself with capable and dedicated people. He has imbued scores of young men with the desire to work hard and accomplish worthwhile things. His honor and integrity have made a profound influence on hundreds who have worked for and with him. His policy of fair dealing has been one of the keystones of his monumental success.

Love of people comes naturally to him. We observed an example of this Tuesday at the opening of his new store. A woman came in with two handsome twin baby boys. He stepped over and spoke to her and congratulated her on her two fine sons. After she had started shopping, he told one of his associates to be on the lookout when she came to a checkout counter, and to notify her that all of the items she had selected were to be with his compliments.

It was in 1926 that Wood Brookshire entered the grocery business in Lufkin with his brothers. He moved to Tyler in 1928 to open the third store for Brookshire Brothers. Ten years later, he acquired the company's three Tyler stores. He now heads 23 supermarkets in East Texas and Shrevesport. We predict there will be many more.

The Brookshire operation is owned by our longtime friend and his two sons, Bruce Brookshire, executive vice president, and S. W. Brookshire, vice president and north district manager. Serving as vice president and manager of the eastern district is Zack Nutt, who has been with the company many years. This trio will play an important role in the continued growth in the Brookshire organizations. They have accepted wholeheartedly the responsibilities placed upon them and are performing admirably.

While it is not our pleasure to have known Louis Morgan as long as we have known Wood Brookshire, we have observed with great admiration the pride and progressive spirit that he has manifested since coming here 15 years ago. He has given Longview three modern drug stores of which any city in East Texas would be proud, and his new location will compare favorably with any in the metropolitan centers of the nation.

Wood Brookshire and Louis Morgan have a kindred spirit, and it is not by happenstance that they have adjoining stores in three Brookshire Centers here. They believe in progress—and they believe in East Texas!

We feel we bespeak the sentiment of citizenry of Longview and this area when we say to these two fine businessmen we are proud of them, and offer our warmest congratulations for another big accomplishment on their part.

Let us hope that what they have done will serve as an incentive to others in this area to make the most of the opportunities that abound here.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues who this week have risen to express their renewed sense of obligation to the people of the captive nations of the world. Certainly if any principle is basic to America it is that the people of every nation must be able to freely determine their own destiny without coercion from outside powers. Where they are not, then America must help, through efforts such as those made in Congress this week, to maintain the spirit of freedom in the oppressed peoples.

We know, of course, Mr. Speaker, that there are other captive nations in the world besides those in Eastern Europe where the Soviet Union's power stands as an ever-vigilant guard against meaningful self-determination. Countries such as Rhodesia and South Africa, where a small white minority refuses political and economic freedom to the majority of the inhabitants of the nation, can just as rightly be called captive nations and, as Senator Kennedy of New York has shown in his recent trip, even in these countries America can function as a symbol and hope for a better, freer life. If America is to fulfill her true "manifest destiny" it will be by ever raising her voice to salute freedom and to encourage those who would create nations where the rights of the individual would be free from government coercion, where the will of the majority would be able to determine the political direction of the country.

I would also like to comment, Mr. Speaker, that the dedication to freedom and self-determination expressed in Congress this week gives me renewed hope that we will move this session to end the last vestige of outside rule in our country and approve meaningful home rule for the District of Columbia.

Disability: A National Health Problem as Seen From Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

Disability: A National Health Problem as Seen From Capitol Hill

(Remarks of U.S. Representative John E. Fogarty, Second Congressional District of Rhode Island, at Georgetown University symposium, Washington, D.C., Thursday, June 9, 1966)

I accepted with pleasure this invitation to appear here tonight, because I welcome every opportunity to participate in an activity whose aims is to improve the health of the American people. This seminar today is such an activity.

I have been asked to talk to you this evening on disability, a subject that is of as much concern to me as a legislator as it is to you as physicians and health workers, although from a somewhat different point of view.

Health matters have traditionally been a great concern of law as well as of medicine. The history of health legislation is almost as old as the history of lawmaking itself in this country. Let me go back for just a moment to these earliest efforts on the part of governing bodies to halt the inroads of disease on the citizens of our first colonies. Our earliest health laws were related almost exclusevely to the spread of disease through travel, which was originally of special importance in maritime traffic and more recently has become important in air traffic.

In Colonial America, the earliest quarantine restriction, to halt the spread of disease from foreign ships, was enacted in 1647 by the Massachusetts Bay Colony against ships arriving from Barbados, and in 1700 the Province of Pennsylvania enacted legislation "to prevent sickly vessels coming into the government."

Although the original legislative health efforts were directed specifically against communicable diseases entering by sea, governing authorities began to develop broader health concerns as early as 1754 when the Colonial Government of New York impesed a tax on all seamen and passengers entering the port of New York, and with these funds provided not only quarantine hospital accommodations but estiblished the first city dispensaries and provided financial support to the Society for the Reformation of Juvenile Delinquents.

In 1798 the U.S. Public Health Service, now the principal health agency of our country, was created as a Marine Hospital Service when an act of Congress providing for the relief of sick and injured seamen was signed by President John Adams. Proponents of the Act were not concerned with the humanitarian considerations alone, but argued also that the National defense demanded a National program of direct medical and hospital care for seamen, since the merchant fleet had always been a major element of the Nation's naval defense.

In the more than a century and a half which followed these pieces of legislation, Congress has often demonstrated its continuing interest in the health of the American people. This interest is based upon a conviction that a healthy nation is a productive nation and that a general state of National health is an economic asset and an essential component of defense even if there were no human issues involved. This Congressional concern has been reflected in such laws as these:

Legislation to control a third "killer" disease was enacted in 1833 as the result of a widespread outbreak of cholera, and authorized the use of revenue cutters in enforcing quarantine laws of States and cities.

The world-wide pandemic of influenza in 1918 stimulated Congress to appropriate one million dollars for the Public Health Service to use in suppression of influenza in the United States. In the 20's, the Veterans Bureau, later to become the Veterans Administration, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs were both established by law.

And so it has gone, with each decade bringing new laws relating to health and disease control.

A new dimension of health concern began with the National Health Survey of 1935, the first definitive survey of health to determine the relationship of disease and certain environmental factors such as income, education, and housing conditions. This survey brought together for the first time information that formed a basis for Federal, State, and local action directed toward the prevention and control of the chronic as well as the communicable diseases, and stimulated the development of programs aimed at the bettering of social and economic conditions among the deprived of our Nation.

Beginning with the impact of the findings of the first National Health Survey, and given additional impetus from World War II, there has been a gradual but substantial shift of legislative perspective in regard to health. This has evolved as a response to the changing health needs of a changing society. That our society has changed, few persons would argue.

For example, while by no means entirely eliminated from the health picture, the communicable diseases and the sanitation problems incident to these no longer have a dominant claim on either medical or legislative attention. Just as our society has changed greatly in the past 30 years, so it will no doubt continue to change, at least into the foreseeable future. A glance at the population figures reveals one very basic factor: we are becoming a Nation of the very young and the very old. We have increased our life expectancy to span the decades in which chronic diseases are increasingly common and their crippling effects more disabling.

We have managed to control the great killers of the past—yellow fever, smallpox, cholera—but we have created new killers and cripplers to take their place. Heart disease, cancer, and stroke claim over a million lives every year and disable many more. Vehicles with fatal highway speeds cause mass crippling in the youth of our land. We have acquired great technological skill, but with it a longer life span in which to develop social and economic hardships in the so-called "golden years".

We have, in short, set the stage for disability. For nearly a century we have collected statistics on mortality. Only in recent years have we really begun to realize the vast implications—of chronic and malignant diseases, of injuries and old age—for those who do not appear on our mortality tables because they are not yet dead.

What are some of these implications? In the three great killer diseases I have just mentioned—heart disease, cancer, and stroke—death itself is not the only tragedy. If those individuals we have listed in the statistical tables as "survivors" are merely snatched from the jaws of death to become doomed to a bedfast existence at home or in the back wards of public institutions then the advances merit only limited praise. There is abundant evidence, however, that disability no longer need be accepted as the natural and inevitable aftermath of cancer surgery, or heart disease, or stroke, or old age; evidence that disability can be prevented or minimized; evidence that knowledge already available could be more fully utilized to offer useful and productive years to be lived in dignity by millions of chronically ill and aged persons.

I am referring, of course, to that area of medical care known as medical rehabilitation. For in this portion of comprehensive health care lies our conception of medical science as a tool for health, rather than limiting it to the bare provision of basic bodily survival. We have in the past directed our major medical and legislative efforts toward those activities—from immunization to organ transplant—designed to prevent death. But we have an additional obligation to those whom we have rescued—we must insure that that life is worth living. We must do more than substitute one tragedy for another. And this is where medical rehabilitation comes into focus.

The respect I have for those who cultivate the fields of rehabilitation is profound. I have come to know many of these workers well. Through the work of the appropriations subcommittee which I have chaired for several years, I too have endeavored to serve the disabled people of this country. In these years I have had an opportunity to gain an understanding of the national problem posed by disability and an awareness of the obstacles to delivery of medical rehabilitation services to those who need and could benefit from them. I have come to understand that medical rehabilitation, or disability control, or whatever you choose to call it, has vast potentials, not only in restoring the disabled to a high level of independence, but in preventing disability from developing.

Those of you here today are demonstrating by your presence at this seminar on the management of the chronic disease patient your concern for better care of this segment of the poplation. You and your counterparts in other sessions of his type are seeking to expand the horizons of medical care for this neglected group. You are denying, in effect, the validity of medical attitudes which claim that nothing can be done for those so unfortunate as to be afflicted with chronic diseases and old age. You are attempting to find solutions to the common problems associated with disability. We have learned by now that shutting the disabled out of sight accomplishes nothing. We can never build enough custodial "boxes" even for this. And we should not try.

In the process of gathering information relative to disability and to the need for rehabilitative services throughout the country, I have come to view rehabilitation in its broadest sense—health care concerned with preventing disability and maintaining function, as well as restorative services to those with existing impairments—as the window on the future. I am convinced that health measures enacted by Congress and health services provided by physicians and other health professionals must all take into account the chronicity of many illnesses and conditions. In our fight for life-saving techniques, let us make sure that it is really the whole life we are saying. Let us philosophy be based on reality, and let our goals be based on a belief in the true worth of man.

Workers in public health know that when large numbers of people need health services which in the usual course of events they do not receive, then it becomes a public health problem. When such a need is widespread, then it becomes also a national problem and of concern to legislative authorities. That there has been legislative recognition of such national health problems is evident in such laws as the following:

The Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961, which provides for demonstrations of new methods of providing community health services, including a variety of rehabilitation services.

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 and the Nurse Training Act of 1964 are both designed to increase professional health manpower, for without sufficient personnel to provide health services, the most desirable and effective medical program falls short of its goal.

The Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke Amendments of 1965 which assigns responsibility to the Public Health Service for encouraging and assisting the establishment of regional cooperative arrangements among medical schools, research institutions and hospitals, designed to forge a closer link between the centers of scientific and academic medicine on the one hand, and community health services on the other. This legislation specifies that this forthright program must not interfere with present patterns of patient care and professional practice, but it is nonetheless a revolutionary piece of legislation. It is designed to develop and disseminate medical knowledge of treatment techniques through cooperative efforts of medical resources in the community.

Nowhere in the legislation, or in the testimony in its support before the Congressional committees, will you find a blueprint for this program—because there is no Federal blueprint and it is not intended that there should be one. The pattern of grants-in-aid, already so well established and so successful in the support of medical research, will also be followed in this new program. These grants will be made in response to local initiative, to facilitate local planning, and to assist local execution of the plans. The emphasis of this program is clearly on bringing this country's proven research capability—as reflected in the medical schools and research hospitals—into a closer relationship with medical practice, as a resource for the practitioner, the local hospital, and the community health services in a wide geographic area.

The Social Security Amendments of 1965, which provide health insurance benefits to the aged and is popularly known as "Medicare." This legislative package evolved out of a recognition that it is one thing to have improved medical service, but quite another thing to pay for it. The rapid and dramatic increase in the costs of hospital care and health services generally is alarming. It is alarming because it means that despite our general prosperity we are still putting some forms of medical care beyond the reach of many of our citizens. This is not a tolerable situation. I am not contending that the charges made for medical services are excessive in relation to costs, or in relation to value but merely that they are still too often excessive in relation to ability to pay. Fear of the doctor's bill or the hospital bill should not be the factor that keeps members of any economic group from availing themselves of medical care.

There is another aspect to this problem of costs which disturbs me. This is the attempt to extend to the field of health services and medical research the concept of cost-benefit economics generated by our defense and space technology. These approaches start off with the assumption that every public act must be weighed in terms of its economic rate of return. This is a concept which we must reject out of hand. It involves a principle which cannot be applied to health.

This is not to say that there are never economic savings as a direct result of medical care. Certainly, the nearly 200,000 vocationally rehabilitated persons each year are returning to the labor market and paying taxes where formerly they contributed only to the costs of medical care, or prevented a family member from being employed. But there are millions of citizens with no employment potential. Those over 40, handicapped and uneducated for other than manual tasks; those with deteriorating chronic diseases; those past retirement. What of these? How do we measure the dollar costs to society of not providing them with necessary health services? And if we could do this, would it be in any way a yardstick of the human values involved?

There will be new advances in medical science in the years to come, and there will be new laws relating to health. Hopefully, breakthroughs in preventing death will lead to enriching human life as well, and emerging legislation will consider the human above the economic values of life. Medicine and law have been partners for generations in this land of ours. I expect this to continue into more and more areas, such as poverty—which goes hand in hand with disease and disability—and old age—which has outlived the killer diseases of youth only to fall heir to the chronic diseases in later years—and ignorance—which prevents the delivery of appropriate health services to all who need them.

Only then, when all men have the opportunity to achieve and to maintain their highest potentials, may we—the health professions and the lawmakers—rest upon our laurels secure in the knowledge that we have done our job faithfully and completely.

Open and Shut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Sun supports the recent liberalization of passport rules applying to travel to Communist China and four other countries. It is well, the Sun says in an editorial, to have the United States moving further toward on open-door policy.

We scored a point in principle by announcing the relaxation as Red China reportedly was shutting its travel doors even more tightly because of domestic political troubles, the newspaper feels.

Our position is strengthened, in the Sun's opinion, by the examples provided by Red China and by Russia in canceling a trip by its athletes to this country for a United States-Soviet track meet.

The editorial follows:

OPEN AND SHUT

In principle, the United States scored a point by announcing a further liberalizing of passpart rules applying to travel to Communist China (along with Cuba, North Vietnam, North Korea and Albania) just as Communist China was reported to be shutting its doors to foreigners because of its domestic political purge.

Whether the relaxing of our State Department's restrictions will result in a larger number of Americans going to Communist China will depend, of course, on whether China will open its doors. Its internal troubles are serious and widespread, as we can see from the lengthy discussion of them in official Red Chinese publications, and no one can be sure what their outcome will be.

But in any case it is well to have the United States moving further toward on open door policy. The examples provided by Red China, shutting its doors to Americans, and by the Soviet Union, shutting its doors to its own athletes as an expression of political policy, help to affirm our position.

University of Miami Cuban Doctors Program Eulogizes Antonio Micocci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be able to inform my colleagues of a unique and humanitarian program being conducted at the University of Miami School of Medicine. The university is conducting a postgraduate program on basic medical sciences for Cuban dentists, pharmacists, and veterinarians in order to enable those already skilled professionals who were forced to flee their homeland to obtain a license and practice in the United States.

One of the stanchest supporters of this program was our good friend, the late Antonio A. Micocci, staff adviser of the Cuban Refugee Program. "Tony"" Micocci gave tirelessly of himself to these refugees from communism and they recognized his efforts by dedicating their "Memoir" or yearbook to him. Upon learning of his untimely death, they added a page "In Memoriam" to Tony Micocci. A translation follows:

IN MEMORIAM: ANTONIO A. MICOCCI

"Many thanks for whatever you can do to asist your fellow professionals from Cuba to make a new start in this land of Freedom, they have paid so dearly to reach." [1]

---

[1] Paragraph of a letter written by Mr. Micocci to a Professional Association of North Americans, in February, 1966.

When this memoir was being finished, sad word was received in Miami of the death of Mr. Antonio A. Micocci, Staff Advisor of the Cuban Refugee Program.

The first draft of this memoir was given by the Dean of the School of Medicine, Dr. Hayden C. Nicholson at the closing of the course. He was surprised to find out that the Memoir was dedicated to him.

At the end of the ceremonies Micocci told us how glad he was to meet the Cuban dentists, pharmacists and veterinarians. "I receive great satisfaction from filling this position. The talent of the professional Cuban should be carried on in this country and returned to Cuba when it becomes free. I regret having to receive compensation for my work. I would like to be in conditions that would permit me to donate my time and effort to such a noble cause."

In one of his last letters he asked me to invite a Cuban doctor to go practice in a small town in the North; "where I would like to live when I retire". He could not see his wishes come true.

Rest in peace Antonio Micocci, great friend of the Cubans, to whom he always referred as "we" never as "you".

Rafael A. Peñalver.

Better Air Travel Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services has been looking into the problems encountered by servicemen traveling while on leave. This may seem a relatively minor matter when compared to major defense money bills or the overall posture of our military establishment, but anyone who has ever traveled while in uniform knows that it can present difficulties for the serviceman and his family.

This investigation to date has been extremely productive and is a superb example of how a great deal can be accomplished without fanfare or headlines. The following editorial from the July 27, 1966, issue of Air Force Times lists the results:

Better Air Travel Deal

The current House of Representatives' study into travel problems of servicemen on leave is a good example of how to get quick—and, we hope, long-lasting—results without writing a batch of new laws.

The hearings, conducted by Rep. Richard Ichord (D., Mo.) in his first subcommittee chairmanship, already have stimulated action throughout the government and the American airline industry. The beneficiary of all this activity is the serviceman.

When House Armed Services Committee chairman L. Mendel Rivers announced the investigation, we frankly were skeptical. The South Carolina lawmaker, a powerful man in the military realm, has no control or legislative authority over the airlines. It was difficult to see how he could do much to ease the plight of servicemen forced to wait as long as 30 hours to get a seat aboard an airplane (under the standby 50 percent fare plan). Now we all can see what Mr. Rivers was getting at, and we can clearly see how he and Mr. Ichord are going to get there.

While some new laws are likely to develop from the subcommittee hearings, beneficial developments already have taken place. For example:

Defense has established a full-time committee to identify the problems of servicemen traveling on leave status. This group is trying to work out contracts with some of the airlines to send extra flights to and from military areas during peak traffic hours. It also is working on a plan whereby large groups of trainees can get home at the end of the training course aboard chartered planes, paying the considerably cheaper charter fare.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has given its approval to the airlines' getting together to come up with consistent, nationwide policies for standby travel, without getting the airlines in trouble for violating the antitrust laws. CAB has told the airlines to frame plans which will guarantee that military passengers won't be bumped during stops en route.

Several airlines already have agreed to sell confirmed, reserved seats to servicemen at reduced rates. One will now guarantee that a military standby passenger will get a reserved seat on the next flight if the first flight can't accommodate him.

Another program triggered by the subcommittee is Operation Combat Leave, which provides military planes to take Vietnam-bound men home on leave during the airlines' strike.

Defense also has recommended to the CAB and the Air Transport Association that the airlines sell 50 percent discount tickets to servicemen for specific, reserved seats on days other than the heavily-traveled Fridays and Sundays. The airlines are interested.

The more than 100 flights per month by Air National Guard and Reserve planes in support of Vietnam operations will be used to carry servicemen on leave. Many of these planes can carry as many as 100 passengers, so the number of seats being made available soon will number in the thousands per month. That's progress resulting from some simple snipping of red tape.

Defense is examining a proposal to use dual configuration on State side logistical flights. In other words, the part of the plane that isn't filled with cargo could be filled with seats.

Defense also is considering having staggered release dates for leave purposes, so that more servicemen would start their leaves around mid-week when rides are most available.

It's also a good bet that the House Armed Services committee will soon consider a proposal to provide commercial airplane rides to all servicemen on emergency and convalescent leave at government expense.

The airlines themselves have not yet had their day in court. That will come in early August when the hearings resume.

Meantime, the probe so far has had a most salutory effect. It had focused the spotlight on (1) some things that shouldn't have been tolerated, like the "bumping" of servicemen in remote towns; and (2) on things that both the airlines and Defense should have done but didn't.

Nice going, Messrs. Ichord and Rivers, for paving the way to a better air travel deal for servicemen.

Open Letter From Chicago to Dixieland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include a column by Paul Harvey, the celebrated news commentator, which appeared in the Danville Bee, Danville, Va., July 19, 1966. In this article, Mr. Harvey extends the apologies of the people of Chicago, and other areas, to the South for their criticism of the South and for the slandering publicity in regard to racial riots in that area.

We of the South understand the Negro race, and they understand the white race. In Virginia, the races have lived in peace and harmony for more than 300 years. We can continue to do so if these lawless demonstrators, agitators, and troublemakers, parading under the cloak of "nonviolence," can be kept away from that area. These lawless outbreaks and law violations are inspired by the Communists. These flagitious forces swarm in like the "locusts of Egypt" whenever and wherever they believe they can foment racial discord and strife, and incite to riot.

Paul Harvey has requested the sympathy and the help of the southern people. I would suggest first, the defeat of the present so-called civil rights bill, H.R. 14765, and the repeal of those other vicious, spurious, unconstitutional pieces of legislation passed in the immediate preceding Congresses which, instead of suppressing racial strife and discord, have served to acerbate the same.

The excellent letter of Paul Harvey is as follows:

Open Letter From Chicago Is Addressed to Dixieland

(By Paul Harvey)

Dear Dixie: Can you possibly find it in your heart to accept our sincere apology? When there was race rioting in Little Rock, Arkansas, we were convinced that the cause was callousness. Our public officials and our press in Chicago insisted that the only two reasons for Negro restiveness were your segregated schools and your stubborn governor. We in Chicago, with integrated schools and a very liberal governor are now writhing in the agony of race rioting. And as we seek to set our house in order, we hope your headlines will be kinder to us than ours were to you.

And when a Mississippi Negro boy was found drowned, we in Chicago called this the "inevitable result of a white-supremacy tradition." Now a Negro girl, 14 and pregnant, has been shot to death on the front porch of her own home in Chicago—and we are confused and ashamed—and frightened.

What are we doing wrong that has made eight square miles of our city a battleground? Help us, if you can find it in your own hurt heart to help.

And Alabama, when your state police were photographed subduing rioters with night sticks, Chicago's bold-face front pages condemned you for "indefensible brutality." Now Illinois State Police have resorted to armored cars and cracking skulls and shooting to kill . . .

Your governor has alleged that "Communists are fomenting this strife." We scoffed.

Now 13 Negroes on Chicago's West Side have been charged with "plotting treason." We are sweeping admittedly Communist literature from our littered streets.

Forgive us for not knowing what we were talking about.

Georgia: When you were photographed in the act of turning back crowds of marching children—we could not control ourselves. "The very idea," the Chicago press editorialized, "that youngsters should be considered a menace sufficient to justify the use of tear gas!"

Now, in our own asphalt jungle, we have seen Negro youngsters of 9, 10, 11—advance on police with drawn guns or broken bottles—screaming, "Kill Whitey!"

And we used gas and clubs and dogs and guns and, God forgive us, what else could we do! Can you, Georgia, forgive us, too?

We tried the patience we had preached. Honest, we did. We tried so desperately that seven policemen were shot the other night, two of them through the back. So, in the end, we resorted to methods more brutal than yours. But, don't you see, we had to!

And our mayor listened to the Negroes' leaders, as he so often admonished you to do. He had listened, he had made compromises and confessions and he had offered sacrificial police officials and school officials—but they kept coming from so many directions with so many demands—and then—demanding to keep the fire hydrants gushing for their playing children during the city's most critical drought—

Dear Dixie, perhaps we have not yet learned fully to appreciate what you have been trying to do to effect evolution without revolution—but for whatever belated comfort it may be, from our glass house we will not be throwing any more stones at you . . . . . . for a while.

The Pro Draft and College Baseball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly no secret that the people of Alabama are sports minded. To embellish that statement further would be totally superfluous. Alabamians, however, for the most part are devoted followers of amateur athletics—particularly at the three school levels; college or university, high school, and elementary.

One of the leading authorities on Alabama athletics and commentators on the general sports scene is Mr. Sam Adams, of the Montgomery Alabama Journal. Mr. Adams recently wrote me concerning the play-for-pay football folks who now appear to be making the same mistakes as have been committed for the last two decades by baseball men more eager for a profit than for the preservation of the sport. I share Mr. Adams' concern, and feel certain that my colleagues will be equally alarmed upon reading the piece which he enclosed from the newspaper Collegiate Baseball, and his own column of Monday, June 27, from the Alabama Journal.

The articles follow:

[From Collegiate Baseball]

AACBC CHARGES: PRO DRAFT RUINING COLLEGE BASEBALL

OMAHA.—College baseball, charging that the professional draft of players is wrecking the campus game, has called upon the Congress of the United States for relief.

In a sharply worded resolution the American Association of College Baseball Coaches, meeting here during the College World Series, seeks the aid of Congress in urging professional baseball to end its drafting of players and "encouraging student-athletes to leave college before the completion of their education."

The AACBC asks that professional baseball follow the practice of professional football and basketball in protecting student-athletes through four years of college.

John (Hi) Simmons, University of Missouri coach who is president of the AACBC, declared, "We are at a crucial time. When professional baseball drafts between 800 and 900 players and will sign less than half, maybe only one-third, I think the time has come to take some sharp action. The professional baseball people do not have enough minor league teams left to play all the players they are drafting. And they are wrecking the college baseball program—the last place remaining for players to gain experience.

"The time has come for our organization to seek relief through legislation."

Coaches attending the meeting of the AACBC reported that the professional draft has cut such inroads into collegiate baseball that some areas of the country are thinking of dropping the sport.

Lee Eilbracht, secretary-treasurer of AACBC and coach at the University of Illinois, said that athletic directors of the Big Ten Conference "are seriously considering dropping baseball as a collegiate sport because of the pro raids."

Eilbracht said, "We have been trying to get together with the pros the last 16 years. Our committees have met with the pros and we have had little success in arriving at an agreement. Some people in pro baseball want to help us, but I don't believe the owners do.

"It is very possible that the Big Ten will give up baseball. We're all getting murdered by the draft. It is time for action."

And W. F. (Dutch) Fehring, baseball coach at Stanford University, said that the Athletic Assn. of Western Universities, is "highly disturbed" over the problem.

"One athletic director in our area told me," Fehring said, "that if the pros continue to take athletes off the campus, he is in favor of dropping baseball completely. And I ask if there is no college baseball, where will the pros get trained players? They've killed off the minor leagues."

George Wolfman, baseball coach at the University of California at Berkeley, said that he was instructed by his school to lodge official protest against the professional draft.

"We cannot wait any longer to seek relief," Wolfman declared.

SPORTIVELY SPEAKING

(By Sam Adams)

You would think professional football would have profited by the many mistakes made by major league baseball in recent years. But apparently policymakers of the two play-for-pay football circuits no longer want to enjoy cordial relations with the people responsible for operating high school and college football programs.

This is evident in the schedules of the National and American Football Leagues for the coming season. Both have scheduled games that will be in conflict with high school and college contests, with the high schools encountering major opposition in early season.

If these week day games are televised—and many of them will be—high schools throughout the country will suffer at the gate. Attendance at prep games played in the proximity of a week day pro game, even though not televised, will shrink.

AFL WORST OFFENDER

The American League is the worst offender. It has games scheduled for two Friday nights, both at Miami, and seven on four different Saturday nights, two of them in Houston.

But the National League had to get into the act by opening the season with a single game (Green Bay at Baltimore) on Saturday night, Sept. 10, and approving a Friday night game at Los Angeles on Sept. 16.

The seriousness of such scheduling can be found right here in Alabama, or coming near home, Montgomery. Friday night, Sept. 9, is a good example. The majority of Alabama high schools will be playing that night, many of them in season openers. On the same night the Miami Dolphins will be host to the New York Jets. Should this game be televised, thousands of fans who normally would watch their high schools play will stay home to watch Joe Namath operate against Miami, a team well stocked with Auburn players.

Now let's come home with the problem. On the same night, the Lee High Generals will be playing their opener at Cramton Bowl against Ensley and the Lanier Poets will be in Selma for an opening engagement with the Parrish High Rams.

A much smaller number of Alabama high school games scheduled the following night, Sept. 10, will suffer the same fate. Their followers will remain by their TV sets and watch Bart Starr and the Packers go against Johnny Unitas and the Colts.

Webster would define such treatment of the high schools as ruthless, but maybe rotten is a better word.

THREE GAMES ON THANKSGIVING

Both leagues compete with the colleges on Thanksgiving Day with three games, two involving National League teams. And there is no justification for these conflicts, although few in number. This is a holiday that should be left to those schools wanting to use it for a football date.

Until 1964, when there were an outbreak of premature signings, professional football had stuck pretty close to a policy of not interfering with high school and college football. But it now appears that lust for television gold is gradually destroying this just and honorable consideration of the school football programs.

There isn't any doubt the schedule conflicts that have arisen this year resulted from competition between rival television networks.

But pro football leaders must realize that all the television money in the world won't replace the steady stream of player talent produced by the high school-college system. Too, they must know that greed for the radio and television dollar has destroyed minor league baseball. Also that campus raids for talent has given baseball a bad image and is gradually choking off the last source of player material.

INVITING TROUBLE IN WASHINGTON

And surely the bigwigs of professional football must know that the high school and college people, if pushed around, could cause trouble in Washington. All of them have a congressman and two senators ready to listen to the problems of a constituent. Cries of anguish from the folks back home have stirred up a lot of storms in Congress, you know.

The cool and sensible heads of professional football would do well to see that interference with the high schools and colleges ceases.

American Seapower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with the Members of the House an important address by our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], on the subject of American seapower. As ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] is an expert in this field whose analysis and warning should be heeded in the agencies of our Government and wherever men and women are concerned about the security of the United States. The address follows:

AMERICAN SEAPOWER—WHERE ARE WE GOING?

The great 17th century Dutch statesman, Jan De Witt, once admonished his fellow countrymen in the following fashion, and I quote:

"Never in time of peace . . . will they take resolution strong enough . . . beforehand . . . unless danger stares them in the face . . . I have to do with people who, liberal to profusion where they ought to economize, are often sparing to avarice where they ought to spend." Well, today, three centuries later, the Johnson Administration is subject to the same reproach. It, too, is liberal to profusion where it ought to economize, yet sparing to the point of folly where it ought to spend.

The even greater irony, however, is that the lopsided priority of the current federal budget allocating our national resources is being accomplished at a time when danger is staring us in the face—the very real danger that, within the time frame of the mid-1970's and beyond, the United States will no longer be a major world sea power, and that we will have abdicated our position of maritime superiority to none other than Soviet Russia. Thus, the title of my remarks—"American Sea Power—Where Are We Going?"—is simply a manifestation of my deep personal concern over the current shocking de-emphasis in our national maritime efforts.

The concept of sea power and its importance to the United States is neither new nor complex. At the turn of this century Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan gave the all time classic statement of the effect of command of the seas upon the destiny of nations. Since then his concepts have been fortified and expanded to a point where today, as at no time in our history, sea power is vital to both our national security and our economic well-being. The misfortune, however, is that nothing that is so readily understood or so blatantly apparent as the importance of sea power seems to concern our policy makers of today!

In its broadest sense, and conceived as an integral whole, sea power is the ability of a nation to project into the world ocean in times of peace its national sovereignty; in times of war, its military might. It is composed of all those elements enabling a nation to use the oceans advantageously during either peace or war—its navy, its merchant shipping, its shipbuilding, its fishing industry, and its knowledge in the field of marine science and engineering (now usually referred to as oceanography). It is within this frame of reference that the United States, as a world leader with global security commitments, must face-up to the issue of the future sufficiency of its elements of sea power.

We face today and in the future what frequently has been referred to as the new four-ocean challenge. The naval conflict in World War I was a one-ocean war centered about the North Atlantic. World War II was a two-ocean war involving the North Atlantic with the adjacent area of the Mediterranean and the Pacific Ocean. These two ocean areas—the North Atlantic and Pacific—still remain of primary concern, but advances of modern science and the retrenchment of traditional allies have added two new ocean areas. The third is the Arctic Ocean to the north as a result of accessibility gained with nuclear submarines. The fourth is the Afro-Asian Ocean embracing the broad expanse of the South Atlantic and Indian Oceans, extending all the way from New Guinea across to the southern shore of Asia and Africa. The withdrawal of France from Indo-China left us as the only western nation capable of filling the power vacuum in the Asian theatre, a factor which has been further enhanced by Great Britain's announced intention to phase out its fleet air arm and hint of eventual military withdrawal to "West of Suez." Whether we have the requisite national leadership to marshal and direct the national will to meet this expanding challenge at sea, and the foresight to provide adequately for the tools of sea power—fast, modern ships and skilled seamen to man them—is a matter of utmost concern to me.

U.S. NAVY

Despite the absence of any major naval engagements, the U.S. Navy has been playing a significant role in the current conflict in Southeast Asia ever since the Tonkin Gulf incident of August 1964. At that time we had but three attack carriers deployed in the western Pacific, one of these being kept on the line in combat readiness at all times. But, as the need for tactical air strikes increased faster than our ability to construct air fields ashore, additional carriers were called for until today there are five carriers in the western Pacific with three of these on the line at all times, providing about half the air strikes against North Viet Nam, plus tactical support. In addition, U.S. Navy units, augmented by the U.S. Coast Guard, are maintaining patrols in the waters off Viet Nam.

The importance of this ability of the Navy to carry the war to an enemy located more than 8,000 miles from our shores cannot be too strongly emphasized to demonstrate the geographical and tactical mobility of sea power. However, in our praise for the Navy's admirable response to this demand, let us not lose sight of, and fail to capitalize upon, the shortcomings brought to light on this Southeast Asian proving ground. But, in doing so we must assume the risk of being accused by our esteemed Secretary of Defense of taking ". . . pleasure in flailing ourselves with imaginary weaknesses." Or, perhaps we, too, will be favored with the more succinct retort, "Baloney!"

Well, regardless of how Mr. McNamara wishes to slice the baloney on this occasion, the fact is that, great as our Navy was at the end of World War II, it has now reached a critical point in obsolescence both by age and technology. Two-thirds of our naval tonnage consists of vessels designed to meet combat conditions prevailing more than twenty years ago. Some of these ships have been converted and modernized, but there is a practical limit to the process of trying to make silk purses out of sows' ears—a factor which the Department of Defense "whiz kids" frequently seem to forget to crank into the computer. As I stated on the floor of the House of Representatives six years ago, and I quote: "A fleet of ships with limited capability—and such limitations increase with years of service—cannot do the job. * * * To expect World War II ships, even though modified and modernized, to continue to perform reliably after twenty years of strenuous service is absurd; . . . to demand naval fulfillment of present and prospective worldwide commitments with obsolete or obsolescent major vessels is to invite costly operational losses in peacetime and disastrous unreliability in time of combat." So acute has this problem become that the Secretary of the Navy has stated that for the next ten years the Navy's needs call for the building of a ship a week, if we are to keep our position on the seas from deteriorating. Yet, our current rate of construction of nuclear warships is such that professional naval officers point out it will take 200 years to replace our present fleet!

Military hardware, like all machinery, wears out, but this deterioration is further accelerated by the rapidity of technological developments. Obsolescence arising out of technological change is perhaps the gravest threat to the future responsive capabilities of the Navy, since the vessels we design and construct in the immediate future will be those which must serve us into the 21st century. Yet, despite this widely recognized fact, Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover pointed out to the House Committee on Appropriations in May of this year that the President's budget request for fiscal year 1967 for the construction of major surface warships represents only 3% of the total Navy budget and, that for the three prior fiscal years, the Defense Department has not requested the construction of a single major surface warship of either nuclear or conventional propulsion. As a matter of fact, it is only owing to efforts during the Eisenhower Administration that today we have in the fleet three nuclear-powered surface warships—the carrier *Enterprise,* the missile cruiser *Long Beach,* and the frigate *Bainbridge.* Moreover, the frigate *Truxtun,* which is the only nuclear-powered surface warship currently under construction, was changed from a conventional oil-fired vessel to nuclear power, not upon the initiative of the current Administration, but rather by Congressional action five years ago.

Notwithstanding the superior operational capabilities of our three nuclear-powered surface warships demonstrated during their recent deployment off Viet Nam in actual combat operations, and the fact that they can withstand the rigors of continuous high speed better than any warship of the past, the Johnson Administration continues to drag its feet in the field of nuclear naval construction. Of course, the Secretary of Defense has tacitly acknowledged the errors of his ways by now requesting a second nuclear aircraft carrier. But, oddly enough, in the same request the Secretary seeks to build conventionally-powered escorts which can only serve as a limiting factor upon the operational capabilities of nuclear carriers. This continuing frustration of the Navy's modernization efforts by the "dead hand" of cost effectiveness and the hesitancy in high places of the Executive to make the transition from oil to nuclear propulsion boldly and unequivocally simply begs the question —Will we meet the future challenge at sea with modern high speed nuclear-powered surface ships?

STRENUOUS DUTY IN VIET NAM

Further aggravating the problem of obsolescence of our naval vessels is the strenuous duty to which they are being subjected in Viet Nam. Units of the Seventh Fleet are being kept in a state of underway combat alert for periods as long as 30 to 40 days at a time, making it next to impossible to conduct routine maintenance. Moreover, it is reported to be commonplace for naval personnel to work 16 to 18 hours a day. The aircraft carrier, *Coral Sea,* for example, was deployed in the western Pacific for a period of 11 months, 8 of them in combat. Ships, like automobiles, if run hard enough and long enough cannot help but wear to the point where there will be a succession of failures until the only economical solution will be new construction. As Admiral A. G. Ward pointed out in November of last year when speaking of the Navy's role in Viet Nam, and I quote: "It would be difficult to continue indefinitely to maintain our current level of deployment without increases in force levels and in manpower."

Bear in mind also that this potential maintenance problem and deferral of routine overhauls is arising in the absence of any major naval conflict to cause battle damage. As Rear Admiral E. J. Fahy, Chief, Bureau of Ships, commented before the House Committee on Appropriations last March, and I quote: "We are really keeping our fingers crossed that we do not come up with something in the way of battle damage." And, on a related subject before our own Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the same time period, Vice Admiral Glynn R. Donaho, Commander, Military Sea Transportation Service, stated, and I quote: "We are having difficulty in even keeping the ships up that we are operating in our own fleet." Again, in recent weeks I received a copy of a letter from a young sailor assigned to a fleet oiler operating off Viet Nam, in which he wrote, and I quote: ". . . this ship is run down and falling apart. Forty rivets were leaking when we came into port last week . . . . when we were out by Viet Nam our radar was out, both radios were out, the fathometer was out and one steering engine was out. * * * A guy dropped a hammer in the bilge the other day and it went through the bottom. It's rusted out."

I would surmise, also, that the limited demands of Viet Nam are taking their toll in adversely affecting the Navy's responsive capability in other areas of the world by "robbing Peter to pay Paul." For example, as a result of the decision to take the carrier *Lake Champlain* out of service and to transfer the carrier *Intrepid* to the western Pacific, the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral David L. McDonald, testified this year that, and I quote: "Our ASW [antisubmarine warfare] capability as far as the hunter-killer force in the Atlantic is concerned is reduced by two-fifths." Thus, while you cannot get anyone to officially admit it because of Department of Defense "muzzling," I have good reason to be concerned over the general ability of the Atlantic Fleet to meet many demands of its contingency plans.

Viet Nam has served also to raise the question of whether our active fleet contains sufficient non-nuclear fire power to assure the continued success of the Navy in gunfire support missions. Fear has been expressed that since World War II the Navy's gunfire support capability has been allowed to deteriorate in the backwash of more glamorous weaponry to a point where we may have a possible "gun gap." For example, during fiscal year 1966 the Navy found it necessary to reactivate four missile ships for Viet Nam and to retain two heavy-gun cruisers which had been scheduled for deactivation in fiscal 1967–68. It has even been recommended by Vice Admiral John S. McCain, Jr., that the battleship MISSOURI be reactivated at the earliest date to accommodate General Westmoreland's continuing demands for naval gunfire support. I strongly concur in this recommendation.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

We should be doubly concerned over the direction of American sea power if, as Admiral Mahan states in his "Elements of Sea Power," and I quote: ". . . sea power . . . includes not only the military strength afloat, . . . but also the peaceful commerce and shipping from which alone a military fleet naturally and healthfully springs, and on which it securely rests." The unfortunate truth of the matter is that the general condition of the American Merchant Marine today is deplorable and borders on being a national disgrace. It is obsolete both physically and economically since more than 80% of the ships were constructed during World War II and are destined to reach the end of their economic life within the next five years. Personally, I can think of no unhealthier fountainhead for our Navy to spring from, or no more insecure base on which it should rest! Yet, it is this same American Merchant Marine which has been called upon by the Johnson Administration to go to war in Viet Nam while the rest of our economy remains at peace.

This same American Merchant Marine responded to our country's defense needs in World War II, in Korea, and now in Viet Nam with many of the same ships constructed 20 years or more ago. The only noticeable difference between Viet Nam and the Korean conflict of 16 years ago is that airlift is transporting 2% of the military supplies to Viet Nam, reflecting a splendid increase of 1% over Korea! American-flag shipping today is again demonstrating that the art of war is the art of the logistically feasible. Over a sea route of more than 8,000 miles, all the bulk petroleum requirements of Viet Nam, 98% of all the military equipment and supplies, and two out of every three fighting men are being transported by ship.

Thus, as in the past, the American Merchant Marine is meeting the shipping needs of our Nation's security requirements, but it has been severely taxed to accomplish this end. Several American-flag subsidized ship operators whose ships were the first to be diverted to Viet Nam since they were the most modern, found that they were required to take the unprecedented action of chartering older, foreign-flag ships to maintain commercial services. Still other American-flag ships were chartered from non-subsidized operators. Also, we already have reactivated more than 100 World War II vintage ships from our National Defense Reserve Fleet at an average cost of about $500,000 per ship, and an additional 40 to 70 are scheduled to be reactivated before the end of this year. It is becoming increasingly apparent, therefore, that we are well on our way to the figure of 200 reactivated cargo ships, which I anticipated as early as August of last year in a statement made on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Almost 19 months ago, in his State of the Union Message of January 1965, President Johnson promised to submit to the Congress a "new" maritime policy to revitalize our ailing merchant marine. Consistent with the lip-service being paid the American Merchant Marine by the present Administration, we are still waiting for that promise to be fulfilled. Meanwhile, as reported by the Maritime Editor of the Baltimore Sun, and I quote: "Since President Johnson first stated on the floor of Congress that a new maritime policy was forthcoming, the United States has slipped from first to sixth place in size of its active fleet; from sixth to fourteenth (or fifteenth) in ship construction, and literally to rock bottom in the number of new ships being built to fly the stars and stripes."

The Congress has before it today the President's budget request for new merchant ship construction, representing a cut of about one-third below the prior fiscal year's level of actual appropriation. If everything breaks right, this might give us a dozen ships for the Vessel Replacement Program, which even now is about 100 ships behind schedule. This is the replacement program which was started during the Republican Administration in 1958. Yet, under the stewardship of this Democratic Administration there has been an increasing and cumulative slippage in the program, and with almost diabolical precision the American Merchant Marine is today being slowly but surely strangled through budgetary privation.

By way of comparison, the budget request for new merchant ship construction for fiscal year 1967 is about one-half the amount requested by the Republican Administration in fiscal year 1959 at a time when the total federal budget was about 60% of the present level. Thus, there is more than ample merit to the recent characterization of the American Merchant Marine as a "Hero in War—Stepchild in Peace" since today it is truly treated as a stepchild in the Great Society!

U.S. SHIPBUILDING AND SHIP REPAIR

During this same period, American shipyards have been chided by Administration spokesmen for failing to modernize their facilities and become more competitive, yet it is this Administration that is depriving the industry of ship construction support funds necessary to enable our yards to modernize. Then we have these same agencies of the Executive using their own criticisms as a vehicle to advance the cause of building American ships in foreign shipyards.

The Department of Interior, for example, earlier this year was proposing the construction of stern-ramp trawlers in Polish shipyards, yet the same Administration spokesman has testified in the Senate one year earlier that he knows of no one in Government desiring to construct ships abroad. Similarly, only last week the press reported that the Department of Defense is proceeding to award a $17 million contract to a British shipyard for the construction of two survey ships. And, finally, we have had the former Maritime Administrator, the Honorable Nicholas Johnson, stating, and I quote: "We may very well end up sinking our [merchant] fleet in the name of preserving our shipyards." * * * unless we embrace the concept of constructing our ships abroad.

Now, every school child knows of our international balance of payments problem, and the fact that the President has had the Secretary of Commerce out beating the bushes for months urging private American businessmen to reduce their expenditures abroad. Yet, on the matter of ship construction we have not one but several agencies of the Executive actively promoting the blatantly contradictory concept of buying ships abroad. You reconcile the inconsistency of this approach. I am unable to, unless it is "Do as I say, not as I do!"

More importantly, however, this trend to foreign ship construction evidences an ignorance of the importance of American shipyards to American sea power. Shipyards are a defense industry and as much a part of a nation's sea power as its Navy and its merchant shipping, witness the current demands upon our ship construction and repair facilities because of Viet Nam and the present shortages of skilled shipyard personnel.

In the four year period from 1961 to 1965, twelve American shipyards were forced to close, and further threatening to deteriorate the industry by reducing the geographical diversification of our shipyard facilities, we have both the Department of Defense and the Maritime Administration proposing single shipyard contract awards. By far the one promising to have the greatest effect is that of the Department of Defense with its Fast Deployment Logistic ship project valued at $800 million to $1.5 billion to be financed entirely by the taxpayers. Yet, the investment of these same funds under the subsidy provisions of existing federal legislation could reduce the cost to the taxpayer by as much as one-half and yield from two to three times the number of ships now contemplated under this program.

U.S. FISHING INDUSTRY AND OCEANOGRAPHY

No examination of the direction of American sea power would be complete, of course, without consideration of our fishing industry and our efforts in the field of marine science and engineering. As the population of the world increases and our resources on land diminish, we must look to the oceans for food, fresh water, raw materials and power.

Unfortunately, the United States fishing industry is plagued by many of the same problems afflicting our merchant marine and is in a state of relative decline. When the higher labor costs of the American standard of living are combined with antiquated vessels and outmoded equipment, international competition becomes exceedingly difficult, if not impossible. Because of this, roughly every other fish in an American frying pan is imported. Congressional concern over the state of the industry has resulted in some federal assistance to alleviate the situation, but much more remains to be done.

In the field of oceanography, the Federal Government finally stuck its big toe in the water when on the 17th of last month the President signed into law the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966. This represented the culmination of seven years of congressional effort, commencing during the Republican Admiinstration in 1959. An earlier congressional effort to coordinate federal activity in this field received a pocket veto by the late President Kennedy following the adjournment of the 87th Congress.

Hopefully, this new federal legislation in the field of oceanography will serve as a catalyst to bring about a unified national effort so as to enable effective exploitation of the promising rewards of this area of so-called "inner space." Our effort heretofore has been disjointed and has been described by one foreign observer in the following terms: "The administration of U.S. oceanography reminds me of a contemporary abstract painting rendered by an ape!"

Our total national oceanographic program budget for each of the past three fiscal years has been at a level of less than 4% of that provided for our "outer" space programs. In the field of education over the last twenty years, only about 50 undergraduate degrees and less than 900 graduate degrees have been conferred by major institutions offering courses in the field.

U.S.S.R.: SEAWARD THRUST

What is really most disturbing about this generally unfavorable direction being taken with American sea power is that while we appear to be "fiddling and declining," Russian sea power is modern and growing at a fantastic pace. Two years ago Hanson W. Baldwin noted in his article, "Red Flag Over the Seven Seas," and I quote: "If to vast Russian land power is added major maritime power, the problem of deterrence becomes formidably difficult. If we lose control of the seas, it becomes impossible." Yet, this is the very real danger that now stares us in the face.

Today Russia has the second largest navy in the world. Its merchant marine is growing at the rate of about one million tons a year. Its fishing industry has invaded every major fishing ground in the world, and she will soon surpass even Japan as the leading industrial fishing country. Russia's annual catch, for example, is valued at close to four times our balance of payments deficit. And, she has more than 100 oceanographic vessels employed worldwide.

The point is that since World War II the Soviet Návy, like the Soviet merchant marine and fishing fleet, has been transformed from what was formerly a coastal defensive force into a "blue-water" offensive fleet. And, the intensity of this Soviet seaward thrust has not faltered for lack of funds, including the expenditure abroad of scarce "hard" currency.

The British publication "Jane's Fighting Ships" assesses this Soviet drive in the following terms, and I quote:

"The Soviet Union is reaching out with her naval units and infiltrating in a multipronged movement into all the seven seas, not only with combatant ships but with intelligence trawlers and research ships in a determined effort to achieve a worldwide naval capability in conjunction with a challenging increase in her merchant fleet and developing a maritime strategy as a major factor in her overall policy of extending her influence throughout the world.

* * * * *

"There is no doubt that the Soviet Navy is growing with the object of challenging U.S. supremacy at sea. The Soviet Union now understands the value of sea power."

CONCLUSION

Even without this growing Soviet threat, the present unfavorable direction of American sea power should be a matter of national concern. Yet, when I add up the negative actions of the past five or six years, in the face of our ever-expanding worldwide military responsibilities and the growing demands of the American industrial complex for raw materials from overseas, I am not overly optimistic. It seems crystal clear that we, unlike Soviet Russia, are sadly lacking in an appreciation of the value of sea power. We appear to be pursuing the idiotic course of sticking our heads in the sand, blithely ignoring this very real threat to our national security and economic well-being in the hope that, like a bad dream, it will go away. But the fact remains that the challenge is real and unless there is a rebirth of national leadership—and soon—we will be aroused from this dream-like state by what Admiral Mahan called, and I quote: "The rude awakening of those who have abandoned their share of the common birthright of all people—the sea."

Camp Roosevelt: A New Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend there was dedicated in the George Washington National Forest, in Virginia, a recreation area which is located on the site of Camp Roosevelt, the first Civilian Conservation Corps camp in the United States.

This camp was established in the spring of 1933. One of the Army officers responsible for the opening of this camp was a young second lieutenant who only shortly before had begun his Army career. His name was William F. Train. The selection of this young officer over 30 years ago for such an important assignment was prophetic in a career of one of America's most distinguished officers of the Army. The fine work that he did in assisting in the opening of this camp was characteristic of his performance of later assignments in the Army.

Second Lieutenant Train is now a lieutenant general and is the commanding general of the 1st Army.

It is most appropriate that he should speak at the dedication exercise marking the opening of the Camp Roosevelt Recreation Center, and I would like to make available to other Members of the House the remarks of General Train as he reminisced about an important assignment that he was given early in his Army career.

REMARKS BY LT. GEN. WILLIAM F. TRAIN, COMMANDING GENERAL, 1ST U.S. ARMY, AT DEDICATION OF CAMP ROOSEVELT RECREATION AREA, GEORGE WASHINGTON NATIONAL FOREST, JULY 17, 1966

The privilege of joining you in the dedication of this Camp Roosevelt Recreation area is an honor which holds a twofold pleasure for me.

The mere fact of visiting this magnificent section of the Blue Ridge Mountains, with all the splendor of its natural beauty, is always truly an enjoyable experience for me.

On this occasion, I am doubly delighted because this site recalls one of the happiest memories of my Army career.

It was here that, in April 1933, before I had completed my second year as an Army Officer, I was assigned the responsibility of laying out and building the first camp for the Civilian Conservation Corps.

That was a cheerful task and a rewarding one despite the vagaries of the weather which varied from deep snow to an equal depth of mud and despite the arduous labor of hewing a clearing in the forest.

The job was a dual conservation effort.

On the one hand, there were some 200 boys from all parts of the United States but gathered off the streets of Washington, D.C., who were to be directed into useful and healthful work and thus saved from the evils that lurked in the idleness of the depression years.

On the other hand, we had before us the formidable task of opening up the trails, thus preserving the beauty of this scenic area for the enjoyment of the people.

Getting here to undertake the job was an ordeal in itself.

Our CCC company departed by bus from Fort Washington across the Potomac from Mount Vernon early on the morning of 3 April 1933.

I was second in command under Captain Leo Donovan, who later rose to major general before his retirement from the Army following World War II.

After numerous mechanical breakdowns and contract disputes with the bus drivers, our company finally arrived here between 10 o'clock that night and two the next morning.

A representative of the forestry service was awaiting us.

Our first major problem was 18 inches of snow which fell on the second day and turned into a wallow of mud on the third.

Undaunted by this adverse turn of weather, our boys went about their job energetically and enthusiastically under my supervision and that of a few local carpenters and members of the regular army cadre.

Since our building supports were large diameter logs which floated in the foundation holes, it was necessary to have a boy stand on each while I ran a level line.

Another boy followed me to pull by boots out of the mud.

We had been instructed to have the camp completed in a week for a visit by President Roosevelt.

Anticipation of his visit stimulated considerable progress during the first few days despite transportation and terrain problems.

Unfortunately, for reasons unexplained, the President cancelled his visit.

We named the camp for him anyway.

During the few weeks I was in charge of construction, I found great satisfaction in observing how the boys, most of them raised in city environments, adapted themselves readily to the work of woodsmanship.

I also was pleased to note the healthful effects of their work in the outdoor atmosphere and their obvious pride in their accomplishment.

You may know that at the time each boy received $5 cash a month, whereas $25 was sent to his family.

At the same time our private soldiers were paid $21 a month.

Their initial efforts and the unending work of the forestry service during the ensuing three decades have borne ample fruit in the beauty that exists today in the George Washington national forest and this Camp Roosevelt recreation area.

I know of a State Governor who was in a CCC camp and is now buying up CCC camp sites for similar recreation areas.

I am well aware of the tremendous contribution of the work of the CCC to the awakening of our Nation to the protection of its valuable forestry resources.

As I behold this enchanting scene, I recall a thought from John Muir, the pioneer in American forest conservation, who said:

"The forests of America, however slighted by man, must have been a great delight to God; for they were the best he ever planted."

The Camp Roosevelt area, I am sure, will remain a delight to God and to countless visitors in the years to come.

Inflation Curb Sorely Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I was relieved to read of President Johnson's plea for Government frugality made Tuesday at a meeting with ranking Democratic and Republican members of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees. His concern was again voiced later in the afternoon at a White House press conference.

The President requested that Congress make every effort to keep Government expenditures within the limits of his proposed budget. He advised us that with the possibility that supplemental appropriations may be necessary to finance our military operations in Vietnam, it is extremely important that we in Congress hold the line on nonessential costs. He expressed concern over the problem of inflation and indicated that unless spending is held in line, an increase in taxes may be required to control our overheated economy.

I definitely share the concern the President expressed Tuesday in this matter of inflation. Indeed, I have been deeply troubled over this mounting problem for several months. By appropriating money for programs that are neither urgent nor essential, we are indeed adding to the problem of inflation. The United States is presently involved in an expensive struggle in southeast Asia, both in terms of life and money. Our appropriations for this war have reached enormous size, and with these increased costs comes the genuine threat of uncontrolled inflation. Programs which, in themselves, are good ideas and desired by the majority of Americans will have to wait. Our commitment in Vietnam requires sacrifices. Desired programs must be postponed, or we may be faced with the undesirable reality of runaway inflation.

I feel that it would be much better to hold down the costs of nonessential programs rather than to be forced into increasing income and corporate taxes. For these reasons, I have voted against a number of programs which I consider to be out of line with this philosophy. I don't believe we can afford the risk of tax increases or large deficit spending. The sensible alternative is that which the President suggested Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the President in urging all Members of Congress to use restraint in appropriating funds for governmental operations.

Finally, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial on this subject that appeared the same day as the President's warning about inflation in the Buffalo Courier-Express:

INFLATION CURB SORELY NEEDED NOW

Everything costs more these days. Even borrowing money. And prices—including that of money—seem destined to go higher in the next few months unless something drastic is done to reverse the trend.

This isn't the way it's supposed to work, of course. Raising interest rates—the cost of borrowing money—is supposed to have a dampening effect. That's the whole theory behind the manipulation of interest rates. The idea is that when rates are high, there is less borrowing; when there is less borrowing, there is less spending and when there is less spending prices fall as sellers compete for fewer dollars available.

But this whole theory breaks down if there is just as much demand for money at 6 per cent as there was at 5 per cent. And that seems to be what's happening. Interest rates are higher today than they have been for more than 35 years without any noticeable effect except in the housing and construction industries.

In other fields the classic theory simply hasn't worked the way it was supposed to. As Herbert Rowen of the Washington Post reports: "Businessmen, convinced of good markets and boom times, have willingly paid the price—higher interest rates—to expand their operations and build up inventories."

What the high interest rates have done is to cause a basic feeling of uncertainty among investors in securities and this uncertainty has sharply reduced the volume of trading on the stock market. Most investment is a relatively long-term matter and people simply don't know what to expect of the economy in the months ahead.

Money can be taken out of circulation, even though the higher interest rates failed to do the job. The federal government can do it—by increasing taxes or reducing expenditures or both. These courses are not particularly appealing to politicians in an election year but neither is run-away inflation with its resulting economic chaos.

We learned during World War II and the Korean conflict that governmental attempts to control wages and prices while money is plentiful did not work. We have learned in the past year that an attempt to impose voluntary controls when money is plentiful does not work either.

At this point we need more than anything else some governmental self-control, some real belt-tightening. We could well postpone some of the proposed projects which—while desirable—are not essential. Back in New Deal days, these were called "pump primers." Certainly the one thing we do not need to do in the Great Society today is to prime the pump.

Statement on Fair Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS WALKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Rights Act of 1966 is scheduled to come before the House next Monday, July 25. When this bill comes to a vote, the Members of the House will have to justify their vote on the basis of their oath of office, in which they swore to support the Constitution. For the benefit of my colleagues I am inserting in the RECORD a statement concerning title 4—the so-called fair housing provision—of the administration's civil rights bill, showing that this section is definitely unconstitutional.

This paper was prepared by Mr. Frank Sobolewski who is a member of my staff. It was adopted by the District Heights, Md., Teenage Republicans as a statement of club policy at its July 8 general meeting.

The article referred to follows:

STATEMENT ON TITLE 4 OF S. 3296

Although four civil rights laws have been enacted in the last decade the Johnson Administration has sent a civil rights bill to Congress again this year. The most controversial section of this legislation is Title Four, which would prohibit discrimination on account of race, color, or religion in the sale, rental, and leasing of housing. In effect, it would take away from the individual homeowner the right to sell his home to whomever he wishes. The following is an explanation of my views on this matter.

Before the merits of any legislation can be considered, one must determine whether the bill is constitutional. In this case, the "fair housing" provision fails to meet the test. It is blatantly unconstitutional and there are several Supreme Court decisions on record which show its unconstitutionality.

In the 1963 case of *Lombard* v. *Louisiana*, Mr. Justice Douglas stated in a concurring opinion: "The principle that a man's home is his castle is basic to our system of jurisprudence."

In the 1963 case of *Peterson* v. *Greenville*, Mr. Justice Harlan stated in a concurring opinion: "Freedom of the individual to choose his associates or his neighbors, to use and dispose of his property as he sees fit, to be irrational, arbitrary, capricious, even unjust in his personal relations are things all entitled to a large measure of protection from governmental interference."

The proponents of Title Four have based their argument for constitutionality on two provisions of the Constitution: Amendment Fourteen and the interstate commerce clause. Again, there is no basis for their position.

Amendment Fourteen applies to STATE action and not to the action of an INDIVIDUAL citizen. The Supreme Court stated in the 1948 case of *Shelly* v. *Kraemer:* "The principle has become firmly embedded in our constitutional law that the action inhibited by the first section of the 14th amendment is only such action as may fairly be said to be that of the State. That amendment erects no shield against merely private conduct, however discriminatory or wrongful."

Article One, Section Eight of the U.S. Constitution gives the Congress power to regulate interstate commerce. However, I fail to see how the sale of a house can be considered interstate commerce as long as the house itself does not cross state lines in the process. It has been argued that the materials used to build the house had previously crossed state lines, and therefore, the sale of a house is interstate commerce. However, a deed to a house does not state that Mr. John Doe owns "s" amount of shingles, "t" amount of bricks, "w" amount of lumber, "x" amount of windows, "y" amount of lights, or "z" amount of cinderblocks. It states that he owns a building. Thus, a house is legally defined to be a building and not "n" amounts of building materials.

Now that the question of constitutionality has been settled, let's consider the merits of this proposal.

This so-called fair housing provision does not prohibit all discrimination. It does not prohibit discrimination on the basis or age or size of family. Why doesn't it? Perhaps

Senator Robert Byrd presented the best answer when he stated: "Why the legislation does not make it unlawful for property owners to discriminate against elderly people or against parents with children has not been explained, but one may conjecture that it is perhaps because the elderly folks and the large families have not yet taken to the picket lines and have been noticeably absent from the sit-ins, and thus far, have not threatened to riot."

This section of the civil rights bill, instead of trying to promote equality among the races, actually would grant special privileges toward some citizens at the expense of others. Specifically, this applies to the provision authorizing a U.S. Court, in a case involving a violation of Title Four, to appoint an attorney to the plaintiff at no cost to him, and authorizing the Attorney-General, if he considers the case of sufficient importance, to intervene on behalf of the plaintiff. On the other hand, the defendant is entitled to no such services. Senator Robert Byrd described the problem faced by the defendant by saying: "The defendant property owner, of course, will have to furnish his own attorney and pit his own resources, be they great or small, against the all-powerful Federal Department of Justice and its lawyers whose salaries his own taxes help to pay."

In summary, Title Four is completely unconstitutional and unmeritorious. It does not prohibit all housing discrimination. It seeks to provide special treatment to some instead of equal treatment for all. In short, Title Four should be completely defeated.

Remarks of the Very Reverend Monsignor Leo J. Coady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent graduation address to the graduates of Holy Redeemer School, Kensington, Md., the pastor of Holy Redeemer and the director of Catholic Charities in the Archdiocese of Washington, the Very Reverend Monsignor Leo J. Coady, presented some interesting thoughts in a most charming manner. Under leave to extend my remarks I include Monsignor Coady's remarks:

THE BROOK

It is the mountain to the sea
That Makes a messenger of me:
And, lest I loiter on the way
And lose what I am sent to say,
He sets his reverie to song
And bids me sing it all day long.
Farewell: for here the dream is slow,
And I have many a mile to go.

The stream of your life flows slowly now; it is the quiet brook meandering through the meadow of your young year.

There will be times when you wish it would move faster. Youth is impatient to get into the life of the grown man and woman.

The 14 year old is impatient to be a sixteen-year old when he can drive the family car.

The lowly freshman is impatient to become the lordly sophomore; and the junior can't wait until senior year puts him on top of the heap.

But the brook will keep moving; it won't stand still. And as this stream of your life wanders through the field of the years of time, it gets wider andwider and touches more shoreline and embraces in its view and ever-broader horizon.

What is happening tonight is that this little stream is bursting out into a bubbling brook.

You will now be taking on new relationships, you will be cutting some old ties—old friends will go off in other directions, and you will be acquiring new bands of friendship. New vistas of knowledge will be opened up, and your mind will make many discoveries. Much of what you have been doing will soon seem to be corney kid stuff; and you'll wonder how you stood it.

But the dream is slow and you may have many a mile to go. What you have been doing up to now is merely getting those dreams ready.

What will I do with my life? Where will I go? What path shall I take? These are the questions that will be uppermost in your minds in the years just ahead. You may struggle with them mightily, and you may ask the help of others in coming to an answer. Do not be afraid of the questions; do not be afraid to look at yourself honestly and openly and, above all, do not be afraid to go to others, your parents, your teachers, your priests, and to God Himself, to get some assistance with the answers.

This evening you will receive your certificate of completion of one step along the way to making those important decisions of adulthood. Much has been invested in you by others, by your parents, by your teachers, by the Church in providing you with a system of education that seeks after excellence in all things.

We congratulate you, then, and wish you well in the future. It is our fervent prayer tonight that you may grow in wisdom and grace as you mature in age through the years of growing up.

We ask of you in return that you show your gratitude by your continued loyalty to the pursuit of excellence—intellectual, moral and spiritual—that has been given you at Holy Redeemer, and by an abiding loyalty and interest in the parish family, and in the works of the Church.

May the Lord bless you and keep you; may He give His mercy to you; may He make His countenance shine upon and grant you peace.

H.R. 16369

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 16369 in the House of Representatives, a bill to make certain that employees are not forced by the Internal Revenue Service to pay income tax on reasonable moving expenses for which they are reimbursed by their employers. My bill joins many others, introduced by colleagues of both parties. I hope the Ways and Means Committee will take swift and affirmative action on this much needed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, for some unknown reason, the Internal Revenue Service has been shackled to the absurd reasoning that an employee must pay income tax on all the money he is reimbursed by his employer on an employer-dictated move except the barebones cost of actually transporting his household goods and his family. All of us are aware of numerous other expenses involved in moving: Travel to the new area to search for a new home; maintenance of a family in the new area while they search for a new home; and other miscellaneous expenses associated with moving a family fom one area to another.

As an ex-corporate officer of a substantial research and manufacturing firm and as a member of the often nomadic engineering profession, I have long been aware of the problems involved in moving my own and my employees' families.

Mr. Speaker, I have recently heard from a number of corporate officers in my district, urging me to support the legislation which I have introduced. This legislation was first introduced in the House by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Burke]. The Michigan State Chamber of Commerce, of which I am a member, recently sent me its Federal legislative report, urging favorable action on the bill. I include a portion of the July 13 Federal Legislation Report at this point in the Record:

FAMILY MOVING TAX

H.R. 13070 introduced by Representative James A. Burke (D-Mass) and S. 3181 introduced by Senator Eugene McCarthy (D-Minn) will "un-tax" reimbursements for more types of moving expenses, by removing them from consideration as taxable income. To the "bare bones" expenses, which are already non-taxable, the legislation would add these five ordinary and nearly always necessary expenses:

1. Travel by employee and spouse to hunt for a new house.
2. Temporary living expenses in the new city, until the house is ready.
3. Commissions and other expenses involved in selling former home, or satisfying unexpired lease.
4. Out-of-pocket expenses for buying new home—legal fees, commissions, taxes, etc.
5. Other miscellaneous related expenses—not to exceed the lesser of two weeks' pay or $1,000 for a family man, or of one week's pay or $500 for a single man.

A case example of the problem:

John Brown is an employee of a medium-sized insurance company located in Chicago. He, his wife, and high school son lived in a nice but unpretentious suburb of the city. They had owned the house for nine years. Shortly after the first of the year, John was offered a promotion—if he and his family would move East. There would be a pay increase—$1,000. John's employer had a policy of reimbursing the employee for all the costs of a transfer, so the Browns felt there would be no out-of-pocket expenses. Of course, there would be no way of compensating for the other hardships of a move. "Goodbyes" to old friends, the son's graduation from a high school he would only attend for a few months, and leaving the house that had been their home for nine years. But, they moved. It cost $1,679.08 to move the family and the household belongings. It cost $446.12 for food and temporary lodgings at the new location while they were waiting to occupy their new home. John and Laura made an advance trip to locate housing near a church of their choice and close to a good high school. The total expenses of the trip were $293.56. They paid the real estate broker who sold their old home a commission of $1,272.00. Incidental expenses, such as recutting and installing carpets and draperies, connecting appliances, and new auto licenses comes to $158.99. John's employer fully reimbursed him for moving his family and household belongings. Further, he was reimbursed $293.56 for the costs of house hunting, food and temporary lodging, the broker's commission and other incidentals. Total reimbursement—$3,849.75. *BUT,* the IRS said only $1,679.08, the "bare bones" costs of moving the family and the belongings would *not* be considered income. The difference, $2,170.67, was income to the Browns (according to the IRS), and taxable at their highest rate.

The Treasury Department ruling exempts reimbursements for only two things, which are often called "bare bones" expenses: The cost of moving household goods, and the cost of transporting the employee and his family to the new location. All other reimbursements are taxed as income. These include such legitimate and necessary expenditures as the cost of a house-hunting trip, the cost of selling the former home, the expenses of temporary family housing in the new city, and the like. Further, the rate of tax is that for the individual's tax bracket. The Treasury was upheld by a court of appeals decision in 1965.

On the Edge of Angry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS WALKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks, we have heard about racial violence in four States that happen not to be in the southeastern portion of the United States.

National columnist and noted radio commentator Paul Harvey, in his July 12 column, which appeared in the Meridian, Miss., Star expressed the sentiments of thousands of southerners who are "on the edge of angry."

I commend this article to my colleagues, especially those who have joined the national press in their persecution of my State and other Southern States:

ON THE EDGE OF ANGRY ABOUT SLANTED STORIES

(By Paul Harvey)

There is a time to be calm and there is a time to get angry.

There was a time when even Christ, His patience exhausted, found it necessary to storm into the temple with a short length of rope in one hand and start smashing up the furniture.

I am saddened when anybody walking down any road in Mississippi is shot from ambush.

But I'm on the edge of angry when Mississippi is castigated nationwide for the misconduct of a Memphis, Tennessean.

And when Time, Life, Newsweek, The New York Times, and TV hurl their editorial epithets at Mississippi for one shooting.

MURDER A DAY

And look the other way from a murder a day in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York.

I'm on the edge of angry when one man wounded in Mississippi crowds from the front pages and the nation's conscience 2,000 dead Americans in Viet Nam.

I am on the edge of angry when kookie college kids can demonstrate for peace at any price, but can't find time to shave and take a bath.

And when my government protects those who break the law and intimidates those who dare try to enforce it.

I am on the edge of angry when a college professor can limelight himself by proclaiming "God is dead!"

While a free press ignores the greatest demonstrations of all, when 126 million Americans march—every week—to church!

And when Government tells me I must sacrifice the fruits of my labor to support those who do no labor.

WHY THE DIFFERENCE

I'm on the edge of angry when the tax man says I get an allowance of only $600 a year to rear my legitimate son.

Yet the ADC welfare people would pay me $900 a year if he were an illegitimate one.

I am on the edge of angry, realizing that every baby is born into this one-time land of the free $1,700 in debt.

I am on the edge of angry when we make a big domestic to-do about saving on electricity and groceries in our White House while we dump millions into thankless foreign ports.

When we regulate and regiment and overtax and tyrannize our own countrymen while defending "freedom" for foreigners.

IGNORE THE INDIANS

I'm real close to the edge of angry when I hear our hypocritical breast-beating over the urgent rights of one minority which we ignore the Amish and the Indians.

When we Judas-kiss our sons goodbye because we own weapons adequate to end any war, yet lack the guts to use them.

When we have everything going for us to create a Golden Age of arts, culture, sciences—and let unfriendly friends and friendly enemies siphon away this glorious opportunity.

Between now and November I may move "over the edge" . . . if the best either party can offer is a perpetuation of this sad circus, this pusillanimous political game of crisis—after crisis—after crisis—after crisis.

Eliminating Aircraft Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned over the increasing problems caused by aircraft in the vicinity of the Nation's major airports, particularly at O'Hare International Airport located northwest of the city of Chicago. The problems of noise, safety, volume of flights, landing and takeoff patterns, and others are serious ones for citizens of the residential communities neighboring major airports.

My interest in this matter has caused me to follow closely the Federal Government's approach to providing solutions. I am convinced that the Federal Government can and should do more than it has been doing to find an answer. With this in mind, I strongly support inclusion, under the proposed new Department of Transportation, an Office of Aircraft Noise Suppression which can accept the responsibility for coordinating all Federal activities in this increasingly critical area. The Federal Government must accelerate its effort in research and planning if these air problems are to be eliminated.

I introduce for the RECORD at this point an editorial from the July 14, 1966, editions of Paddock Publications' 16 suburban newspapers which supports a coordinated Federal effort:

REDUCING JET NOISE

Congress has before it a proposal, enjoying substantial bi-partisan support, to create a cabinet-level federal department of transportation. The new agency would amalgamate the functions of most federal agencies concerned with transportation, substituting a coordinated bureaucracy for a splintered one.

Agencies which would be included in the new department are the Federal Aviation Agency, Bureau of Public Roads, Maritime Commission and others. Retaining their current independent status would be the Interstate Commerce Commission and Civil Aeronautics Board.

Both northwest suburban congressmen—DONALD RUMSFELD (13th) and JOHN ERLENBORN (14th)—support the legislation.

In addition, RUMSFELD has announced he will support an amendment calling for creation of an office of aircraft noise suppression within the new department. Purpose of the office would be to coordinate research into the reduction of aircraft noise. As RUMSFELD has pointed out: "The major metropolitan centers of this country must have assistance in solving the aircraft noise dilemma. The residential communities surrounding O'Hare International Airport, for example, must have relief. O'Hare is the busiest airport in the nation and is going to get busier. An answer must be found for reducing this serious aggravation."

Noise around airports is a serious problem here and in suburban areas across the country. There has been little information developed about ways and means of reducing aircraft noise, consistent with safety. We hope Congress pays heed to the suggestion of RUMSFELD and other suburban representatives in a positive effort to make air traffic less a hardship on suburban residents.

Chief Parker and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity, under previous permission to extend my remarks, to call the attention of the House to the passing of William H. Parker, chief of police of the city of Los Angeles. Chief Parker set a high standard of public service in the difficult area of law enforcement. He built the police department of the city of Los Angeles into one of the finest in the Nation. Chief Parker was direct, efficient, honest, and sincere. He brought to the law-enforcement profession across this Nation a new pride and professionalism. He served our city during turbulent times, and although he was criticized by a few, he will always be respected by all.

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Los Angeles Times of Monday, July 18, 1966, which expresses the thoughts of the citizens of Los Angeles in their loss of this distinguished public servant.

Chief Parker and the Law

Los Angeles is in deep mourning for William H. Parker—the man who devoted his life to making this the best-policed city in the nation.

Police Chief Parker is dead, but his dedication, integrity, and professional ability live on in the great department he led and inspired.

"Law and order" was not a casual phrase to Parker. He believed devoutly that no community, no nation could govern itself without respect for the law and its authority.

Those who violated the law, who threatened the person or property of others were his sworn enemies. Chief Parker enforced the law with a single-mindedness and efficiency that led to controversy, but there was never a doubt as to his honesty and sincerity.

These were the very characteristics in a chief that Los Angeles desperately needed when Parker took over in the critical year of 1950. Scandals and low morale in the department had made the city vulnerable to criminal interests.

Before long, however, Parker developed a police force of great pride and outstanding professional competence. No large city has so successfully resisted the challenge of organized crime or won so high a reputation for over-all excellence.

Chief Parker thus epitomized the protection of the law to most citizens. To others he was the defender of the "status quo"—and the focus of resentment toward other law officers and toward laws that Parker enforced but had not enacted.

Yet, significantly, many of the tributes to the late chief came from those who had often differed with him, such as City Councilman Tom Bradley and John A. Buggs, executive director of the County Human Relations Commission. A. L. Wirin, attorney for the American Civil Liberties Union and a frequent critic of Parker, said "I have admired him through the years as an efficient and dedicated police officer."

Although William Parker canont be replaced, a successor must be named. One of his legacies to the city is the number of outstanding police executives in the department eligible to assume the top post.

The new chief must be as dedicated to the enforcement of the law and the preservation of order as was Parker. The Times believes that within the ranks of the L.A.P.D. is such a man, who will also be accepted by all elements of the citizenry—even those who in recent months have been critical of the department.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join our colleagues and other freemen throughout the world in participating in the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week, authorized by an act of Congress in July 1959.

Although this 1 week is set aside for sober reflection and a rededication to purpose, we must continually strive to keep alive the ideals of freedom and independence which burn in the hearts and souls of the valiant people behind the Iron Curtain. We must never digress from our efforts to assist these people in gaining their political, economic, social and cultural independence and to take their rightful place as full members in the society of freemen.

We are not only speaking about Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and other Eastern European nations but Cuba, mainland China, North Vietnam and all other nations which have been subjugated by the force of arms, conspiracy, subversion, and deceit of international communism.

I believe all of us have been heartened by the action of several Soviet satellites over the past few months in asserting their own national sovereignty and political and economic independence. I feel we are beginning to see a change which will eventually prevail in all of the countries now under the whip of internal communism. No matter how hard Moscow and Peking may try to dominate these people and make them helpless pawns in their own design, their free spirit cannot be permanently subdued by armed force. However, this change will not occur overnight and other countries are being continually threatened. We must stand ready, therefore, to assist the captive nations in their present plight by peaceful processes and in their aspiration to throw off the yoke of totalitarianism and to regain their national and individual freedom.

Last year at this time I was privileged to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], in introducing House Resolution 484—which calls upon Congress to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I would like to urge the Rules Committee to take expeditious and favorable action on this and similar resolutions so that force will be given to our moral support of the captive nations. Definite action must be taken to make known our desire to promote the return of the people of the captive nations to the state whereby they can freely determine their own social, political, and economic institutions.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the privilege of presiding over the House when Members observed Captive Nations Week. Having supported this annual recognition since it was first proclaimed by the 86th Congress, I was pleased to act as temporary House Speaker during this year's observance.

In the 86th Congress I cosponsored a resolution in the House which stated that "the Soviet Union have repeatedly declared their determination to pursue relentlessly their political, economic, and ideological drive for a worldwide victory for communism" and "in its efforts to attain that objective through force of arms, subversion, infiltration, and other methods has imposed puppet Communist regimes upon the people of the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe and exerted tireless effort to crush their spirit" and "that the people of the captive nations are still being denied the opportunity to solve their problems by democratic means and to choose, through free and unfettered elections, national governments of their own free choice." It was this understanding that brought Congress to declare, "its belief in the inalienable right of the people of the captive nations to live under governments of their own choice" and "urge the restoration of the fundamental freedoms and basic human rights of the captive nations."

In observing Captive Nations Week this year, we, in America, continue to recognize the human bondage of 1 billion people in the world who are being denied the most basic human right of self-determination. Therefore it is necessary for the free world this year to renew our faith in the cause of freedom for the people of the captive nations. We must continue to encourage them to resist the Communist tyranny which rules their destiny. These people are a deterrent against the Communists desire for world rule. Whatever resistance they offer will keep the Communists off-balance in carrying out their plans.

In view of the Communist aggression in southeast Asia and recent Communist resistance to friendly gestures by our country to ease tensions in the world, it becomes apparent they are trying to solidify their position to regain the control of people in captive nations who are slowly making progress in breaking the bonds that hold them. However these people will not give in to complete domination by Communist tyranny if they are certain that the free world supports their cause in every way possible. The moral support we offer to these people in observing this week as a reminder to the captive nations that we Americans have not forgotten them, will add strength to their determination to once again become free people.

I am proud to join with the voices of the free world in rededicating ourselves in the great cause of liberty for all peoples. Although this week is set aside for this purpose, our words and deeds should continue through out the entire year so that we can realize a day of world freedom in the not too distant future.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great privilege to be able to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in observing Captive Nations Week.

While properly welcoming the many new countries that have joined the family of nations during the present generation we tend to forget that, while old-fashioned colonialism is ending in Africa and large parts of Asia, a new kind of colonialism has taken its place in Europe and the Orient.

Likewise, when we do remember such Soviet colonies as Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and so forth, we overlook the fact that the first victim of communism was Russia and we fail to realize that the peoples of both Russia and China are as much the victims of Communist colonialism as are the Baltic peoples, the Magyars, Poles, Bohemians, and so forth. Soviet Russia is a huge conglomeration of ethnic groups whose independence has been as ruthlessly exterminated by the Communists as it was earlier by the czars.

At the same time that we are expressing our sympathies for the peoples who live behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, some powerful voices are urging closer contacts with Communist China and its recognition by the United States. The same voices call for stepped up trade with the Reds.

There are some who say that "you just can't ignore 700 million Chinese." Have these people forgotten that the Peking Communist regime has, during its 17 years in power, liquidated many millions of people and placed other millions in slave labor camps?

It is certainly inconsistent to welcome new and free countries to the family of nations and simultaneously invite such a destroyer of individual freedom as Red China to sit down and help celebrate. Let us hope that the new nations can maintain their freedom and let us hope that the captive nations will some day soon regain their independence, but let us not defeat the purpose of Captive Nations Week by calling for recognition of Communist China and advocating more trade with Communist Russia.

The Other War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. N. NEIMAN CRALEY, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1966

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, the "other war" in South Vietnam, the effort to improve the economic, educational, and health conditions for the Vietnam people, receives little attention when compared to stories of our military action there. This phase of the fight for freedom and independence in Vietnam is certainly as important since it provides hope for the future of the Vietnamese people when the fighting ceases.

No effort can be more worthwhile nor of more long-term value than educational progress. I should like to include in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post describing this progress at the present time:

EDUCATION EXPANDED BY WAR—VIETNAMESE ENROLLMENT TRIPLED SINCE 1954 FRENCH PULLOUT

(By Raymond R. Coffey)

SAIGON.—It is, Harold Winer observed, "a helluva state of affairs when it takes a war" to get a nation moving educationally.

But one of the happier ironies of the war here is that it has helped make classrooms, teachers and textbooks available for the first time to hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese children.

Winer is chief education adviser in the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) program here, which operates in the midst of the war and which has made most of the educational gains possible.

When the French pulled out in 1954 there were 600,000 children in elmentary schools in what is now South Vietnam—about 25 per cent of the number then in that age bracket.

Today, with a rising population, there are 1,700,000 children in elementary school—almost 65 per cent of those in that age bracket.

Not only are more youngsters in school, but education has been made available to a much wider social and economic range of the population.

In the past schooling was available only in larger population areas. Since 1963, the Vietnamese government and the U.S. aid program have constructed hamlet schools with a total of 8500 new classrooms in rural areas.

During and immediately after the years of French rule, the country had a drastic shortage of textbooks. The ones that were available were often pretty meaningless to Vietnamese children, since the texts were French-oriented.

Reading primers were "all about the snowy Alps of France and other things the kids had never seen," is the way one U.S. official described the situation.

American aid experts got together 36 committees of the best Vietnamese teachers they could find, gave them American advisers, and had them write new texts on every subject taught in elementary schools.

The new texts are based on Vietnamese culture and things familiar to Vietnamese children. Instead of autos and Alps the illustrated texts now are about water buffaloes and rice paddies, and instead of Napoleon the youngsters read about their own heroes.

The U.S. program also has included development of two new normal schools and the training of thousands of new teachers.

With the cooperation of the Vietnamese government, teacher status and salaries also have been notably improved. Two years ago an elementary teacher was being paid 600 piastres (about $9 at the then current exchange rate) a month.

A new increase just approved by the government will raise this to 3200 piastres (about $26.67 at the present exchange rate) a month.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, this week—the eighth annual Captive Nations Week—provides us with an important opportunity to keep the light of truth focused on the plight of the millions of once-free people who now live under Communist domination and on the fact that their freedom and their countries' independence were the victims of aggressive communism.

The purpose of our commemoration of Captive Nations Week in the House this year remains what it has been since the 86th Congress, in which many of us were privileged to serve, unanimously adopted the first captive nations resolution in 1959. That purpose is twofold: to convince the people behind the walls and curtains of communism that the free world has not forgotten nor abandoned them and shall never acquiesce in their illegal captivity; and to rally the free people of the world to a greater understanding of our obligations toward those who have been forcibly deprived of their freedom and of our responsibilities in the preservation and the strengthening of freedom everywhere.

Is is a mark of the significance of our effort and of the sensitivity of Communist leaders to this issue that today, as in 1959, Captive Nations Week continues to be greeted with cries of outrage in Communist capitals. Their objections are understandable, for Captive Nations Week exposes international communism as a most brutal form of imperialism. It identifies the Soviet Union as the world's most oppressive colonial power. And it proclaims the free world's conviction that, like all of history's oppressors, communism must ultimately succumb to man's powerful instinct for freedom.

This year's observance, Mr. Speaker, should serve to remind us that we can do more than talk about the captive nations. The shifts and uncertainties that seem to characterize so much of today's Communist world present a challenge to our capacity to understand and to take reasoned action. The situation requires the most careful attention of the Congress as well as of the executive branch. For this reason, several of us in the House have been sponsoring legislation to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, a committee whose job it would be to study changing conditions in the Communist world, especially in Eastern Europe, to understand more fully the meaning of those changes, and to recommend ways in which we can use those changes to encourage the growth of freedom there.

A concrete example of such an opportunity exists in the apparent desire of Communist-bloc nations to increase their trade with the United States. We shall miss this opportunity if, on the one hand, we abruptly slam the door or, on the other, too readily, and without qualification, open the door to whatever arrangements they may desire.

Communist countries desire to trade because they need to trade. We should trade if it is worth our while to trade, and we can determine whether trade is in our best interests by exploring the possibilities of a political quid pro quo which could bring at least some measure of relief to the peoples of the captive nations.

I have no specific formula to suggest, Mr. Speaker, but I do suggest that this question is one which administration officials should consider seriously and one to which a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, should it be established, could devote some expert attention.

Stevenson Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, in expressing pleasure with the memorial planned for the late Adlai Stevenson, the Washington Post calls attention to our unending responsibilities as a world power.

The institute of international affairs to be established in his name by friends of Ambassador Stevenson will commemorate his service to our understanding of foreign policy, the newspaper states.

Not only was Ambassador Stevenson eloquent in supporting world peace, disarmament, and conciliation, the Post recalls, but he also was a stout advocate of the use of force against aggression. For example, he backed resistance to North Korea and China in order to preserve peace.

Since then, the newspaper remarks in its editorial of July 15, 1966, there have been other "Koreas," and the same high purposes of eventual peace will again involve us in the use of force.

It is hoped that the Stevenson memorial will keep us aware of the responsibility of great power and of the need to resist aggression in South Vietnam—or elsewhere in the world.

I ask that this editorial be made a part of the Record:

[From the Washington Post, July 15, 1966]

STEVENSON MEMORIAL

Adlai Stevenson surely would have liked the memorial his friends are planning—an institute of international affairs. In announcing the memorial today, the memorial committee appropriately marks the first anniversary of his death. And the continuing institute now set up will commemorate, year after year, his service to American understanding of foreign policy.

He had many wise things to say about foreign affairs while he lived and the establishment created in his name will make hereafter contributions to national understanding in his name.

His voice was always eloquent when raised in support of world peace, disarmament and conciliation. But, as is sometimes forgotten, he was also an eloquent advocate of the use of force against aggression. In the midst of the Korean crisis he spoke firmly in support of resistance to North Korea and China. In an article in *Foreign Affairs,* in April, 1952, he defended American policy and asked: "What would have happened if the United States and the United Nations had ignored the Korean aggression?"

This is what he thought would have happened: "Our friends throughout Asia and in the Pacific would with perfect reason have doubted our intention to resist Soviet design elsewhere in that area, and they would of necessity have taken the path of appeasement. Disillusionment would also have swept Western Europe at this impressive demonstration of Soviet-satellite power and of American indecision in the face of a direct challenge. Then would not the Soviet Union, having challenged us successfully in Korea, have followed that challenge with another? And still another? Munich would follow Munich. Our vacillation would have paralyzed our will and worked havoc in the community of like-minded nations. Then when we did succeed in pulling ourselves together we would have found it too late to organize a common front with our friends."

He said it was our object "to convince them that other aggressions, disguised or direct, will meet the same response, and thus deter them from a perhaps fatal gamble."

He was reconciled to and an advocate of the use of force but he did not lose sight of the ultimate object of force in Korea. "By limiting the war in Korea," he said, "we hope to avoid a third general holocaust. We are trying to use force not only to frustrate our immediate antagonists in the hills of Korea but to preserve world peace."

Since then, there have been other "Koreas." The same objectives and the same high purpose of eventual peace will again involve us in the use of force, from time to time. It is to be hoped that the institute formed as a memorial to Adlai Stevenson will keep his countrymen aware of the responsibility of great power and keep them alive to the necessity of resisting aggression in Korea or South Vietnam or Greece or elsewhere in the world.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in July America celebrates the recurrence of the day of its independence. In the same month we also observe Captive Nations Week. On both occasions we assert the same principles: the rights of peoples and nations alike to determine freely their own course of action.

Ever since our independence, generations of Americans have committed themselves to the defense of freedom and justice in their own country; again and again they have given support to the cause of liberty and independence for other peoples and nations.

On our Independence Day we do not merely remember a historical event of the American past but we assert that the ideas we upheld almost 200 years ago are of universal importance and relevant also to the rest of the world. For these reasons we cannot remain indifferent to the fate of the nations of East and Central Europe, and that is why Congress adopted the resolution calling for the third week of July to be designated Captive Nations Week.

In the first decade after World War II the countries beyond the Iron Curtain were Soviet satellites, subject to continuous Russian interference in their internal affairs. They were not allowed to conduct a foreign policy of their own, they were forced to adhere to the doctrine of international communism as interpreted in Moscow. Disobedience was punished, often by direct physical intervention. Today, while from outward appearances conditions have changed somewhat, the hold of the Soviet Union on the 20 captive nations remains intact and remains brutal.

It is for this reason that we must rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom of the captive peoples, and to their right to self-determination.

Establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore and Dedication of Salt Pond Visitor Center, May 30, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Cape Cod National Seashore was formally established during impressive Memorial Day exercises on May 30 last at the Salt Pond Visitor Center in Eastham, Mass.

The Cape Cod National Seashore was created to extend to mankind forever the opportunity to enjoy, within this stimulating and inspiring seaside environment, the outstanding scenic, scientific, and historical values found there. Our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who sponsored the authorization bill in 1959 when he was the junior Senator from Massachusetts, signed the Cape Cod National Seashore bill into law on August 7, 1961.

It was with a great deal of pride that I participated in the dedication ceremonies, because I had cosponsored the first comprehensive bills, along with Congressman Thomas P. O'Neill of Massachusetts, to authorize the Cape Cod National Seashore Park, on May 12, 1958. My bill that year was H.R. 12449. Congressman Philip J. Philbin, of Massachusetts, had earlier introduced a Cape Cod Park authorization bill. Senator Leverett Saltonstall and the then Senator John F. Kennedy cosponsored the bills in the Senate, and Congressman Hastings Keith, who represents the Cape Cod area, and Congressman Silvio Conte joined with us in sponsoring similar bills after they took their seats in Congress in January 1959.

Mr. Speaker, under previous permission I include with my remarks in the Appendix, the program for the establishment ceremony and dedication of Salt Pond Visitor Center, Cape Cod National Seashore, Mass., and the speeches by Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall and Director George B. Hartzog of the National Park Service.

ESTABLISHMENT CEREMONY AND DEDICATION OF SALT POND VISITOR CENTER, 2 P.M., MONDAY, MAY 30, 1966

Lemuel A. Garrison, Regional Director, Northeast Region, National Park Service, Presiding.

Musical Selections: Nauset Regional High School Band and Frank James, Director.

Advance of the Colours: United States Coast Guard, Race Point Rescue Life Boat Station, Chatham Coast Guard Station.

Invocation: Rev. William J. McMahon, Pastor, St. Joan of Arc Parish, Orleans.

Welcome to Cape Cod National Seashore: Stanley C. Joseph, Superintendent.

Remarks: Luther Smith, Chairman of Board of Selectmen, Eastham, representing Towns of the Lower Cape.

Introduction of Guests: George B. Hartzog, Jr., Director, National Park Service.

Presentation of Deeds: Honorable John A. Volpe, Governor, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Acceptance of Deeds and Dedication Visitor Center: George B. Hartzog, Jr.

Remarks: Senator Edward M. Kenne

Remarks: Senator Leverett Saltonstall.

Remarks: Representative Hastings Keith.

Musical Selection: Nauset Regional High School Band.

Establishment Address: Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior.

Benediction: Rev. Richard E. Waters, Pastor, Eastham Methodist Church.

Retirement of the Colours: United States Coast Guard.

Remarks of Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall at Dedication of Cape Cod National Seashore, Cape Cod, Mass., May 30, 1966

Today we dedicate anew one of the lasting landmarks of America.

It was landfall for the Pilgrams, reconnoitering their new homeland. Sea Captains have blessed the guiding glow of Cape Cod's beacons, and intrepid generations of fishermen and whalers have blessed the beckoning anchorage of this beautiful Cape.

These brave people have already given Cape Cod a special place in the American heart. We rededicate it today as another landmark—a gift of untrammeled nature for all the generations of the future.

Each generation has its own rendezvous with the land: the questing seafarers who looked for the headlands of other shores; the settlers who plowed the land and made it prosper.

Now, at a later hour, we turn to this landscape to support and renew other values. We who have chopped and mined and built and machined our way to wealth and power now grope out from our cities, puzzled, yearning, almost wistful, for something we cannot forget. Beyond the noise and the asphalt and ugly architecture we yearn for the long waves and the beach grass; we see white wings on morning air, and, in the afternoon, the shadows cast by the doorways of history.

Cape Cod National Seashore is, in a very real sense, a pioneer park. It marked a turning point in conservation—a reversal of the shortsighted policy of refusing to pay from the public purse to acquire scenic masterpieces for all of the people.

President Johnson described our predicament recently in these words: "The increasing tempo of urbanization is already depriving many Americans of the right to live in decent surroundings. More of our people are growing into cities and being cut off from nature. Cities themselves reach out into the countryside, destroying streams and trees and meadows as they go. A modern highway may wipe out the equivalent of a fifty acre park with every mile. And people move out from the city to get closer to nature only to find that nature has moved farther from them."

The original sponsors of the Cape Cod legislation had deep roots in this Commonwealth and an abiding love for this Cape. Two of them are with us today: Leverett Saltonstall, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, and Hastings Keith, who represents Cape Code in the House. Americans down the generation will thank them for their foresight.

The third cosponsor is gone—but his spirit burns brightly here. If John F. Kennedy had a special attachment to this continent, it was to its shoreline and marginal sea. He agreed, in his private thoughts, with another New Englander, Henry Thoreau, that "the seashore . . . is a most advantageous point from which to contemplate the world." It was part of his conservation philosophy that a father should be able to show his children—all children—the wonders of nature he himself had known. The marshes, the seascapes, the sea itself should remain inviolate for all time for all men.

"We have been slow as a Nation," he told Congress in introducing the original Cape Cod bill, "to adapt our public policies so as to improve the quality and breadth of recreational experience for the Nation. Yet we are aware of the increasingly narrow margin which still exists—especially in the East—for National Park development . . . we know of no alternative . . . which could provide the citizens of the Commonwealth and the national public with such a rich and varied blend of scenic, recreational and scientific values."

With the passage of the Cape Cod National Seashore bill five years ago, the Nation resolved to open its eyes to need for safeguarding and restoring the beauty of our land. Here began a new era of conservation in America. Since President Kennedy proudly signed this pioneering legislation into law, the Congress has added a record-setting thirty-four new national parks, seashores, and other historic and recreational areas to our National Park System.

The Nation's battle to save the common estate is far from won. In October 1963, President Kennedy warned that, "Our economic standard of living rises but our environmental standard of living—our access to nature and respect for it—deteriorates . . . we must expand the concept of conservation to meet the imperious problems of the new age. We must develop new instruments of foresight and protection and nurture in order to make sure that the national estate we pass on to our multiplying descendants is green and flourishing."

This is our only world; if we care, our duty is to love it.

We commemorate here today a love affair with land. And this piece of land—this masterwork of nature—is now dedicated to the people who shall henceforth call themselves citizens of these United States.

Remarks of Director of the National Park Service George B. Hartzog, at Dedication of Cape Cod National Seashore, Cape Cod, Mass., May 30, 1966

Receiving these deeds on behalf of the people of the United States to be administered by the Department of the Interior is a great honor and privilege.

Too few people may appreciate the significance of the transfer of ownership of the Province Lands Reservation. This Reservation is one of the oldest tracts of land in America under continuous public ownership. These dunes and marshes at the tip of Cape Cod were set aside as early as 1670—nearly 300 years ago—by the "Plimoth Colony" in *pioneering conservation action.* In transferring title of these lands, you, in effect, challenge us to carry out the far-sighted action of those hardy pioneers.

One of the missions of the National Park Service is to provide for the enjoyment of the park areas. It is our belief that enjoyment of these great resources is almost inevitable and that our true mission, in this regard, is to stimulate the visitor to open his eyes to this enjoyment in the fullest sense. Our programs, then, are ones that help the visitor interpret what he sees for himself.

One of the most successful tools if we can call them that, has been visitor centers, like this beautiful *building,* and the exhibits and orientation programs presented in it. Our National Park people are here to help.

It is to this purpose—assisting you in getting the most meaningful experience out of your visit to Cape Cod—that we dedicate the Salt Pond Visitor Center.

Amos Martin, Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce, Praises Cubans' Economic Contributions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Latin American community in Dade County, Fla., has made many worthy contributions to the entire area in the fields of culture, international friendship, and economics. The fine Spanish-language newspaper, Diario Las Americas, recently published an interview with Mr. Amos Martin, executive vice president of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Martin, one of the area's outstanding young leaders, has helped to guide the chamber, and through it, the economy of Dade County, to its present high level of growth and prosperity. I believe my colleagues would be interested in reading this excellent article and Mr. Martin's comments on the contributions of Miami's Cuban colony to the entire community. A translation of the interview follows:

Executive From Chamber of Commerce Praises the Latin American Business Activity in Miami

Mr. Amos Martin, Executive Vice President of that Organization said that the Cuban exiles have greatly aided in the development of this area. "Private enterprise: Cornerstone of the Nation."

"The Miami Dade County Chamber of Commerce has as its principal goal to promote the economic improvement of Miami in business as well as in civic progress," said to Diario Las Americas Mr. Amos Martin, Executive Vice President of this well-known organization.

Mr. Martin pointed out that "an important part of this constant progress has been the Latin American businessmen of this area who account for twenty-five per cent of the business volume in the County."

WHAT IS THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE?

The conversation takes place in the new offices of the Chamber of Commerce, having as a backdrop the splendid view of Biscayne *Bay, seen from large glass windows.* Mr. Amos Martin is a young and dynamic man, fervently dedicated to improving this Organization and to strengthen what is the blood of this great Nation: private enterprise.

Explaining what the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce is, Mr. Martin said:

"The Chamber is a voluntary membership Organization that receives contributions and support from owners of businesses, large and small. Our fundamental aim is to encourage private enterprise and at the same time improve the community in all aspects.

"PRIVATE ENTERPRISE: CORNERSTONE OF THE NATION"

Going deeper into the subject, Mr. Martin points out the importance of private enterprise in the astounding growth of the United States:

"The continuous economic apogee of our Nation is based fundamentally on private enterprise. This does not mean that we ignore the social changes that have taken place: we acknowledge and support them. But it is evident that the Government can only grow when it receives the necessary impulse from private enterprise. . ."

We inquire about the vigorous history of the Chamber of Commerce and its diversified activities. The enthusiastic reply of Mr. Martin comes full of information:

"The organization was created in 1907 under the name of 'Board of Trade.' In 1915 its name was changed to 'Miami Chamber of Commerce' and finally in 1955 it was again modified to the one it now has 'Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce'. We have approximately 3,000 members who receive adequate orientation, advice and exchange of information from our organization."

ENROLLMENT FEE

Giving us more details, the Executive Vice President of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce adds:

"The minimum fee to be a member of our organization is $75 per year, payable quarterly. We have a great number of members who are part of the growing Latin American colony of Miami. It is worthwhile to mention the fact that 25% of the volume of business carried out in the County is done by Latin American businessmen in Miami."

Expressing his sympathy towards the Cuban and Latin American businessmen in general in the Miami area, Mr. Martin added:

"It would be a great satisfaction for the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce to have as members of our organization a massive number of Latin American businessmen of Miami, no matter how small their businesses might be. It is good to point out that ninety per cent of the businesses in the U.S. employ an average of 20 people. That is, small business enterprises are a principal part of the economic force of our nation."

PRAISE FOR THE CUBAN EXILE

The reply moves us to ask Mr. Martin for his opinion about the massive presence of Cuban exiles in Miami and its meaning for the community. His words are a touching homage to those who left everything so as not to accept a tyranny.

"They have made a great contribution to this community in several ways. The Cubans in particular and the Latin Americans in general have turned Miami into an international city because of the different activities of every kind that they perform. Likewise, they have greatly contributed to the improvement of the area's economy, not merely as buyers but as businessmen and professionals. Also, a great number of them buy homes, pay taxes and belong to civic groups in the area. Furthermore, they have given us a better perspective of the world and the relations with other peoples."

THEY HAVE BROUGHT A SPIRIT OF FREEDOM

Emphasizing on the Cuban presence in Miami, he added:

"I would also like to say, particularly in connection with the Cuban colony, that they have brought a spirit of freedom, reminding us all of the fighting spirit of our pioneers. Also, their tragedy has made us dramatically remember the blessings that we have in the U.S. and that sometimes we overlook just because we take them for granted."

The conversation with the dynamic executive of the Miami Dade County Chamber of Commerce comes to an end with him speaking, with logical enthusiasm, of what the International Department of the Chamber is:

"Our international division has as an aim the promotion of a greater trade exchange between Miami and the world, especially Latin America. Our principal objective is to offer services to all businessmen interested in trading with other nations. Additional information is furnished about shipping timetables, export data, etc., and we have an expert staff of 'multilingual' employees, that eases any difficulties of interpretation that might arise."

GREAT JOB OF PROPAGANDA

Also, it is timely to point out before closing this report, that the Miami Dade County Chamber of Commerce publishes a well-documented monthly magazine called "The Miamian", under the responsibility of Mr. Amos Martin, and as editor Miss Susan Neuman, that shows graphically the constant progress of Miami and the convenience of maintaining commercial relations with this important tourist area.

Captive Nations Week, 1966

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY P. SMITH III
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, just 2½ weeks ago the citizens of the United States celebrated the 119th anniversary of their Declaration of Independence, and reaffirmed their faith in the principles set forth in that declaration. During the course of this summer, many new nations in Africa and Asia will also observe anniversaries of their achievement of independence. In our celebrations, and in their celebrations, we may see proof that the flame of liberty still burns bright, that in the year 1966 the principles of self-determination and independence for peoples bent on shaping their own destinies and on managing their own affairs have lost none of their force.

But in this year 1966 we must also recognize that there are large areas of the world where these principles are denied, large areas of the world where peoples who were once proud and independent now see the liberties that they cherished trampled upon, and large areas of the world where a new and ominous kind of colonialism holds sway. There are those in this country and elsewhere who think that we must learn to live with this situation, that we must practice the principles of peaceful coexistence even if those with whom we are asked to coexist deny the ideals we hold most dear, and that the world is imperfect and there is not much of anything we can do about its imperfections.

Fortunately, those who hold these views are few. This is the eighth year in which the leaders of this country and the great majority of its citizens have set aside a week designated as Captive Nations Week to show that they care about the fate of millions of people in other parts of the world who have been denied their freedom, to show that the true foundations of peaceful coexistence are self-determination and liberty for all peoples who seek to exercise these rights, and to show that we will never resign from efforts to right the imperfections of the world in which we live.

It is right that Captive Nations Week should follow so closely our annual celebration of the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. For we thereby make it crystal clear that we see the safeguarding of our own independence as linked with the achievement of independence by peoples now enslaved, and that we see our own liberties threatened through the denial of liberty to others. Equally important, through what I hope will be an annual observation of Captive Nations Week, we send a vital signal to the captive peoples in Eastern Europe, in the Soviet Union, in Asia and in the Caribbean.

We show them that we have not forgotten them, that we will not be deluded by talk of polycentrism and de-Stalinization in the Soviet bloc, and that we will not mistake apparent liberalization for real freedom. These peoples must not give up hope. By observing Captive Nations Week, we help to strengthen their faith in eventual freedom. Their faith in their future freedom, we all must know, is part of our strength.

Resolutions of the Connecticut VFW 1966 Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I insert in the RECORD several resolutions passed by the 46th Annual Convention of the Department of Connecticut, Veterans of Foreign Wars, held in Hartford on June 10, 11, and 12 of this year.

Although this fine organization passed 30 resolutions which will serve as the basis for the policies, programs and goals of the organization for the ensuing year, I have, in order to conserve on space, selected those resolutions dealing primarily with matters of national interest.

I had the honor and pleasure of attending the convention on June 11 and will continue to lend my support to, and admiration for, this most worthwhile organization.

Following are the resolutions referred to above:

RESOLUTION ON VETERANS FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE, EMPLOYMENT AND RE-EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

Be it resolved, by Department of Connecticut, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we seek approval of the following recommendations by administrative changes or legislation, as applicable:

1. Modification of the current three-year probationary period by re-establishing a one-year probationary period as a prerequisite for career status.

2. Reformation of the United States Civil Service Commission appeals system, including access to all records, confrontations and examination of witnesses, and right of oral argument in the Regional Offices and the Board of Appeals and Review.

3. Authorization of voluntary retirement for Federal Civil Service employees after a minimum of 30 years, including active Federal Military Service.

4. Vigorous enforcement of all provisions of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, as amended, and opposition to any and all efforts to weaken or reduce the beneficial provisions of this legislation.

5. Adequate funds for the Federal Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Employment Service, Veterans Employment Service, Bureaus of Re-Employment Rights and State Agencies supporting these activities in behalf of veterans.

6. Amendment of the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize retirement without reduction in annunity of employees with 20 years of service by reason of abolition or relocation of their employment.

7. Amendment of the Federal Employees Compensation Act to provide:

A. Repeal of the forfeitures extracted from a veteran by the Service Department when a veteran military retiree is injured or disabled in Federal employment.

B. Repeal of the provision which requires a disabled veteran to forfeit his Veterans Administration compensation when he is awarded a Federal Employees' Compensation for injuries or disabilities incurred during federal employment.

Resolution on Veterans Administration General

Be it resolved by Department of Connecticut, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we seek approval of the following recommendations through legislation:

1. Elimination of the age 23 limitation for completion of training imposed on most beneficiaries of War Orphans Educational Assistance.

2. Public Law 88–151 be interpreted literally to allow waiver of loan guaranty indebtedness where veteran is without fault in creation of the indebtedness or that collection of the indebtedness would work a severe hardship upon the veteran.

3. Reopen National Service Life Insurance program for those veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the period of October 8, 1940, and December 31, 1956 inclusive.

4. Authorization of waiver of service-connected disabilities for the purpose of reinstating "H," "RH," "J," or "JR" policies (the service-connected disability permitted veterans to obtain the insurance initially).

5. Authorization to waive service-connected disabilities to permit granting of the total disability income provisions on National Service Life Insurance policies.

6. Continue as a permanent program within the Veterans Administration insurance issued pursuant to Public Law 88–664 for veterans with service-connected disabilities.

Resolution on Veterans' Administration Compensation Program

Be it resolved, by Department of Connecticut, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we seek approval of the following recommendations through legislation:

1. Substantial increases in disability compensation rates.

2. Substantial death compensation rate increases.

3. Substantial regular aid and attendance allowance increase.

4. Substantial increases in income guidelines and limitations for dependency of parents for death compensation and DIC purposes under Sections 102 and 415 respectively, Title 38, USC.

5. Classifications of campaigns and expeditions involving hostilities as wartime service.

6. Presumption of service connection of psychosis if manifested within three years following wartime service.

7. Elimination of the prohibition against payment of dependency and indemnity compensation in any case because Government Life Insurance was in force at time of death by waiver of premiums under Section 724, Title 38, USC (formerly Section 622, NSLI Act.)

8. Elimination of the requirement for waiver of death compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation in order to obtain the $5,000 death gratuity authorized by Public Law 89–214.

Resolution To Broaden Cold War "GI" Education

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States took the lead in 1956 in demanding educational benefits for Cold War veterans; and

Whereas our efforts bore fruit when in 1966 Public Law 80–358 was enacted which provides educational benefits for all Cold War servicemen; and

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States was the largest and oldest veterans organization who campaigned for the last decade to do justice for our comrades of the Cold War; and

Whereas the final result of the Cold War "GI" Bill was not as broad as that provided veterans of the Korean Conflict; and

Whereas the educational allowance under Public Law 89–358 is less than that of previous veterans' education programs; and

Whereas Public Law 89–358 does not provide on-the-job training or on-the-farm training as in previous veterans education programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by Department of Connecticut, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States supports legislation which will broaden Public Law 89–358 by increases in the educational allowance and providing on-the-job and on-the-farm training for those veterans eligible under this law.

Resolution To Oppose Closing of Any VA Hospitals

Whereas by direction of the President of the United States, upon advice of the Bureau of the Budget, a number of Veterans Administration Hospitals throughout this great nation, consisting of several thousand beds, were ordered closed in 1965; and

Whereas said closing has created a hardship upon veterans needing hospital care with the result that they may be denied immediate entry into a Veterans Administration hospital or compelling them to apply to a Veterans Administration hospital in another state, or, seek private medical care, and

Whereas the present Cold War situation existing between the Free World and the Communist World, has fomented into a "Hot War" situation, with the present day result, that in the service for freedom of mankind, and to carry out the mandate of this great nation under four administrations, four presidents, upwards of 3,000 young Americans have sacrificed their lives, and more than 20,000 have been seriously wounded and/or permanently handicapped, and

Whereas the available hospital beds now remaining in the limited number of Veterans Administration Hospitals, are not adequate to handle the need of 22 million veterans, and

Whereas it is the responsibility of our government for complete care and rehabilitation of thousands of young Americans, with all necessary aid to them to a normal productive life; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States unanimously reaffirm its stand and strong objection to the closing of any VA Hospital; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Connecticut Congressional delegation, the Chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, the Administrator of Veterans Affairs and the press.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in this body and with my fellow Americans everywhere in deeply sympathetic participation in the eighth observation of Captive Nations Week.

I am mindful of the fact that Captive Nations Week, which now has become an American institution of powerful protest marshalling the free world to the continuing battle for complete liberation of the captive nations, is the conception of my good and distinguished friend, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, world-renowned professor of economics at Georgetown University. I have read with keep interest and applauding approval the article by Dr. Dobriansky, entitled "The Traditional Captive Nations Week: Red Nightmare, Freedom's Hope," in the summer, 1966, number of the Ukrainian Quarterly and with this article I will conclude my remarks after some observations on the developments of fundamental significance that have taken place in the Soviet bloc over the last decade. In the course of Khrushchev's de-Stalinization policies the countries of Eastern Europe have begun to assert their political rights of self-determination. Centrifugal trends have broken the unity of the once monolithic Communist bloc. The forces of polycentrism have promoted the growth of independence among states and parties within the Communist camp.

The Soviet Union has come to acknowledge that individual countries cannot be forced indefinitely to act according to undifferentiated dogmas of international communism, and that cultural heritage and national peculiarities make it mandatory for Eastern European countries to have greater freedom of action. The Soviet Union can no longer completely subject the peoples and nations of east-central Europe by virtue of its superior physical force. Compromise and negotiations are gradually taking the place of suppression and coercion. These important changes have filled us with new hope.

Polycentrism has not only affected the international relations of the countries in the Soviet bloc, but it has deeply affected the internal conditions of the countries concerned. The human and political rights of the people are respected to a much greater degree; artists and writers are allowed to speak up more freely than had been the case in the Stalinist era. There is a new openness to outside influences; the people are no longer as sealed off from the rest of the world as before. We hope that these liberalizing tendencies, limited though they may be, will continue to benefit the peoples and nations of East and Central Europe. Only when nations are allowed to determine their own course of action, independent from outside interference, can there be true peace. No man and no country can hold the free will of a people and the political will of a nation captive forever.

Mr. Speaker, the fate of the countries of Eastern Europe has always deeply concerned us; we cannot be indifferent to their striving for freedom and justice. We welcome the progress of greater external and internal freedoms. Yet we have only witnessed the beginning of a movement in the right direction. Much remains to be done. We will continue to support the peoples of the East European nations until that time when they will have gained complete freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I now conclude with the article by Dr. Dobriansky in the Ukrainian Quarterly, as follows:

THE TRADITIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK: RED NIGHTMARE, FREEDOM'S HOPE

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Confusion, misdirected thinking, and the repetition of old errors dominate the current scene in the United States and thus much of the Free World. These dominant trends are, in part, the logical consequences of the superb maneuver engineered by Moscow in the last decade under the deceptive banner of "peaceful coexistence." Continue to build and strengthen the empire within, while all feasible forces are utilized to undermine the enemy without has been the practical essence of this highly successful maneuver. The functionaries in Moscow's *Agitprop* have good reason to gloat over the results and doubtless are banking on even phenomenal successes in the near future.

The needless mess in Vietnam, the NATO rupture, self-paralyzing absurdities about "arrogant power," "escalation," and "containment" again, the steady over-all Red penetrations in Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America, the repeated softening-up process on communism in our own body politic, and the insidious deterioration of our national will for positive victory, whether military or psycho-political, are only a few evidences of the new pattern of confusion and old errors. As though the lessons of U.S. trade with the Axis powers into World War II were never learned, the present drive for easy trade with the Red Empire is another point of evidence. Self-nurtured illusions about "national independence" among the so-called satellites in Central Europe, "the evaporation of the Cold War," a materially explosive Peking-Moscow showdown, and the spread of peace-orienting "capitalism" in the empire also have their able precedents in the illusions of the 30's, when the nature of modern imperio-colonialist totalitarianism eluded the understanding of that generation.

What in all these years has been a cardinal objective of the totalitarian Red Syndicate is a progressive Free World disinterest in the genuine liberation and independence of the captive nations, the oppressed peoples themselves as against the Red states dominated by totalitarian Communist Parties. The enormous advantages of achieving this should be obvious: easier consolidation of the empire, stronger posture for Cold War successes in the Free World, and the moral and political demolishment of Free World democracies. This Red objective, shared by all in the syndicate, is a crucial and integral part of Red psycho-political warfare which Brezhnev, in his report to the 23rd Party Congress last March, lauded as the prime, unsurpassed weapon wielded by a "political army of revolutionaries for class struggles."[1] The heavy emphasis placed at the Congress on the "great, complex art" in "leadership of class struggle"—meaning the imperio-colonialist art of psycho-political warfare—is unmistakable as to what we can expect in the years ahead.

High on the priority list in Red psycho-political warfare is the downgrading and eventual elimination of Captive Nations Week. This has been evident since 1959, and unfortunately some in this country have sought to assist Moscow and the syndicate in realizing this aim. One major element that they hope to capitalize on is a protracted American ignorance of the many captive nations in the Red Empire, particularly in the USSR. Another is the significance of the Week in the current struggle, measured especially by their own reactions. The mountain of evidence formed since 1959 clearly shows that Captive Nations Week is a deep thorn in the side of the Red totalitarians and their efforts to expand the Red Empire chiefly through the art of psycho-political warfare. As in many other cases, they depend on apathy, distraction, indifference, ignorance, and even educated stupidity to accomplish their work for them.

THE ABC'S OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

When this writer wrote the Captive Nations Week Resolution in June, 1959, little did he appreciate the extent to which elements of misunderstanding and cultured ignorance can contribute to Moscow's ends. A sterling example of this was an editorial in a Washington paper that was promptly refuted by the writer.[2] In 1964, another editorial attack against the captive nations in the same organ evoked delight and praise in Moscow.[3] To identify the misleading and disinforming sources among us and, at the same time, to prevent Red manipulation of such misguiding opinions, it is most essential for every American to become familiar with the ABC's of Captive Nations Week.

The Week is sponsored each year by the National Captive Nations Committee with headquarters at 1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. The Honorable Herbert C. Hoover was the honorary chairman of the Committee from 1960 to 1964; Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, has occupied this position since 1965. Over one-third of the House of Representatives and close to one-third of the U.S. Senate are members of NCNC. Every year half of the Governors issue Captive Nations Week proclamations, as does every Mayor in each of our major cities.

NCNC is supported by voluntary contributions from individuals and organizations. Its activities are mainly supported by local Captive Nations Committees that extend from Boston to Miami, Washington, D. C. to San Francisco. Almost every major city has a committee made up of citizens who are quite versed in the ABC's of the Week. In the past few years the movement has extended overseas so that observances now are held in Free China, West Germany, Turkey, and Sweden. Much of this steady growth is regularly noted in the U.S. Congress which legislated the Week in 1959.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

It is often curious that some commentators who write about the Week give every evidence of never having read the resolution and law upon which it is based. For example, one writer has this to say: "When I was in Moscow during the October Party Congress, Khrushchev once again violently denounced the innocuous Captive Nations Week Resolution which Congress passes every year to attract minority votes."[4] As I pointed out in another article, this comment is "a gem of fact, illogic, and fiction."[5] Fact, the Russian's violent denunciation; illogic, the supposed innocuousness of the resolution; fiction, Congress' passing it every year to attract minority votes. Now, to see how writers can misguide, read the resolution which is Public Law 86–90, one of the ABC's:

CAPTIVE NATIONS RESOLUTION

"*Whereas*, the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds; and

"*Whereas*, this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

"*Whereas*, the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

"*Whereas*, since 1918, the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian Communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

"*Whereas*, the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam and others; and

"*Whereas*, these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freemdon for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence, and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist or other religious freedoms and of their individual liberties; and

"*Whereas*, it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of the conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

"*Whereas*, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

"*Whereas*, it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples, through an appropriate and official means, the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence.

"*Now, therefore*, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, that the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

"*The President* is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS: WHO'S NEXT?

The reader will observe that in its fifth paragraph the resolution contains an open-end clause as concerns the enumeration of captive nations. In 1959, after a year of disputes with certain House members who were offered the first opportunity to consider the measure, the writer found it necessary to

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

insert "and others" in order to allow for new captive nations, such as Cuba in 1960, and to gradually familiarize many segments of our public with some old ones. Here, too, the force of stubborn and narrow preconception had to be combatted.

Perspective is the usual, lacking quality in the thinking of those who draw mythical distinctions between "fat" and "lean" Communists, "liberal" and "doctrinaire" Communists, and "independent" and "Soviet-dominated" Red states. Similar distinctions were concocted in the 30's with respect to the imperio-colonialist totalitarians of that period, and easy trade, cultural exchange and other devices were also employed then in the interest of world peace. The list below clearly shows the unitary base of the Red Syndicate; it shows the phenomenal success of the Red imperio-colonialist totalitarians, building an unprecedented empire in the span of less than fifty years and with strikingly inferior resources; it also indicates the poverty of U.S. foreign policy, which committed two colossal political blunders in this century (contributing to the power of the Soviet Russian Empire both after World War I and during World War II) and is now on the brink of committing another with East-West trade plans, the Consular Convention and other myopic measures.

There is nothing like success, and this list is the roll call of Red success, primarily in psycho-political warfare. Given the same course of U.S. foreign policy and the pathetic absence of psycho-political warfare training, this list is bound for extension. Read it carefully and think:

The captive nations—Who's next?

Country and people:	*Year of Communist domination*
Armenia	1920
Azerbaijan	1920
Byelorussia	1920
Cossackia	1920
Georgia	1920
Idel-Ural	1920
North Caucasia	1920
Ukraine	1920
Far Eastern Republic	1922
Turkestan	1922
Mongolian People's Republic	1924
Estonia	1940
Latvia	1940
Lithuania	1940
Albania	1946
Bulgaria	1946
Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, etc. in Yugoslavia	1946
Poland	1947
Rumania	1947
Czecho-Slovakia	1948
North Korea	1948
Hungary	1949
East Germany	1949
Mainland China	1949
Tibet	1951
North Vietnam	1954
Cuba	1960

Who's Next? South Vietnam? Guinea? Colombia? Congo? Laos? Tanzania? Bolivia? Thailand?

REPRESENTATIVE RED REACTIONS

A most important part of the ABC's of Captive Nations Week is the three R's, representative Red reactions to the Week. Accumulated since July 1959, they can fill several volumes. Be they the Khrushchevs, the Maos, Gomulkas, Titos, Castros, and all other squabbling or non-squabbling members of the Syndicate, the Red totalitarians screech at the list of captive nations and vituperatively condemn the Week. There's no mystery as to why they react so. The two mirror their wretched past and their deceptive present—and perhaps their doomed future. Conquest, terror, tyranny, genocide, totalitarian oppression, Cold War operations, the USSR as an "imperium in imperio," illegitimacy, imperio-colonialism, philosophical fraudulence and many other things are reflected by the mirror.

The following, selected at random, scarcely require comment:

"This resolution stinks." (Then, according to Vice President Nixon, "he spelled out what he meant in earthy four-letter words.")[6]

—Nikita S. Khrushchev, July, 1959.

It represents an "hysterical campaign of petty provocation, proving that panic-stricken monopolists are losing the faculty of controlling their own actions."[7]

—N. S. Khrushchev, July, 1959.

"The resolution is a new American provocation and a hostile act."[8]

—Protest of Red Czech regime, 1959.

"I would not be telling the full truth if I did not say that the adoption of this ill-starred resolution was regarded by the Soviet people as an act of provocation."[9]

—Khrushchev, August, 1959.

"Take, for instance, the much-to-be-regretted decision of the American Congress to hold the so-called 'Captive Nations Week' and to pray for they liberation. In this case words other than 'rolling back' were used, but the gist remained the same, the same appeal for interference in other people's affairs."[10]

—Khrushchev, October, 1959.

"When in July of this year American Senators officially shed crocodile tears over the captive nations, they did not forget to cry for Ukraine . . . It would appear that the Ukrainian people are enslaved."[11]

—Red publication, August, 1960.

"Some members of the U.S. Congress, who apparently are not too busy with state affairs, deliver 'moving' speeches, using the same mimeographed crib concerning the so-called 'week of captive nations' . . .[12]

—Nicholas V. Podgorny, U.N., October, 1960.

"It is not at all fortuitous that this time the farce presented by the 'Captive Nations Week' should coincide with the hullabaloo created by American propaganda around the West Berlin question."[13] (Khrushchev again denounced the Week at the Communist Party Congress in October, 1961.)

—Moscow, 1961.

"All progressive mankind greeted the news of the so-called 'Captive Nations Week' with a feeling of anger and indignation. With foaming mouths the imperialist predators insist on the fantastic idea of restoring the capitalist order in the lands of the peoples' democracies and Soviet socialist republics."[14]

—*Radyanska Ukraina*, July, 1961.

"The Americans who invented the 'Captive Nations Week' are like those proverbial thieves who are yelling 'Catch the Thief,' while they themselves are living off the exploited masses in many countries of the world."[15]

—Petro Panch, poet, USSR, August, 1961.

"On the basis of the 'weeks' held in the past, we already know what these appropriate ceremonies represent—unbridled anti-Soviet and anti-communist slander. * * * Yes, it is only thanks to American bayonets that oppressors of freedom and blood-thirsty dictators are sustained in power in a number of countries of the Latin American continent and Southeastern Asia."[16]

—Moscow, 1962.

(In 1962 the Russian imperio-colonialists scored a victory in getting UNESCO to publish the scandalous and fraudulent *Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the USSR*.)

"Is it not high time to discontinue the 'Captive Nations Week' in the United States? That is just as much a dead horse as the 'Hungarian Question.'"[17]

—Moscow, January, 1963

"The President of the United States, losing his sense of reality, has declared 'a week of the Captive Nations' and is trying to turn attention away from the struggle of the Negroes for their liberation."

—*Pravda*, Moscow, July 8, 1963.

"Kennedy is a third-class clown proclaiming Captive Nations Week, which is a despicable animal campaign of the U.S. ruling circles."

—Pyongyang Radio, N. Korea, July 10, 1963.

"With every passing year 'Captive Nations Week' becomes a nuisance. The stupid situation in which the Washington legislators and rulers found themselves is becoming evident even for those who earnestly propagate the imperialistic policy of the U.S.A."

—*Izvestia*, Moscow, July 15, 1964.

"In the United States a farce entitled 'captive nations week' is held every year. The people's democratic system has been in existence for 20 years but the imperialists still ramble on with nonsensical ideas of 'liberating' the nations of eastern Europe."[18]

—Khrushchev, August 1964.

"An annual, pitiful undertaking. One could treat it as a joke . . . One could treat it like that, if it were not for the fact that Captive Nations Week, an annual undertaking organized by men who have long since lost contact with their nations, is supported by the U.S. Congress and by a proclamation of the President of the U.S."

—*Trybuna Ludu*, Poland, July 27, 1965.

"They are beating the drums again across the sea, filling columns in newspapers and delivering hypocritical speeches. For the umpteenth time the ruling circles of the United States are holding the so-called 'Captive Nations Week.' And the propaganda machine is deafening the citizens with 'atrocious' inventions about the fate of nations which are suffering under the yoke of the Kremlin regime."

—*Radyanska Ukraina*, Ukraine,
July 25, 1965.

"Especially disgusting is the villainous demagogy of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called captive nations week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke. These international gendarmes, stranglers of freedom and independence, would like again to enslave the free nations of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. But that will never happen.'"

—Mikhail Suslov, chief Russian ideologist, Vilnius, Lithuania, July 17, 1965.

One can go on and on with these denunciations, drawn from Red China, Cuba, Hungary and elsewhere in the Red Empire. The most important place is, of course, the Soviet Union, which in every respect is the central power base of the empire. In ultimate calculation, every other Red regime, including the Chinese, Yugoslav, Rumanian, and Cuban, depends for its survival on the USSR. No amount of inter-Party squabbles and rifts can hide this supreme truth. So, when Vice President Nixon candidly reported "The Captive Nations Resolution was the major Soviet irritant throughout my tour," what in effect he was saying was that the resolution's ideas tore into the whole tenuous psycho-political fabric of this power center of "world communism." It opened up a fundamental and promising opportunity that we haven't even begun to explore and cultivate.

THE PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATIONS

Another integral part of the ABC's of Captive Nations Week is the successive Presidential Proclamations. Prepared by the restraining and unimaginative hand of the State Department, the general content of these proclamations explains in part why we are still faced with fear and reluctance to seize this opportunity. The reader will find it a most productive exercise to read these proclamations carefully, compare a number of them, and then compare all of them with the resolution upon which they are based. Your comparisons should reveal the essence of our foreign policy plight in the most re-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

cent period. They should also motivate you to fight for the elimination of this plight. Read them carefully:

"CAPTIVE NATIVES WEEK, 1959—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

"*Whereas* the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

"*Whereas* the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

"*Whereas* it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspiriations for freedom and national independence; and

"*Whereas* by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1952, as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

"*Now, therefore I. Dwight D. Eisenhower*, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 19, 1959, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

"*In witness whereof*, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 17th day of July in the year of our Lord 1959, and of the independence of the United States of America the 184th.

"By the President:

"(Seal)

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
"CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
"Secretary of State."

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1960—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

"*Whereas* the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

"*Whereas* the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

"*Whereas* it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

"*Whereas* by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as 'Captive Nations Week,' and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

"*Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower*, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17, 1960, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

"*In witness whereof*, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 18th day of July in the year of our Lord 1960, and the independence of the United States of America the 185th.

"By the President:

"(Seal)

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
"CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
"Secretary of State."

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1961—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as 'Captive Nations Week,' and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"*Whereas* many of the roots of our society and our population lie in these countries; and

"*Whereas* it is in keeping with our national tradition that the American people manifest their interests in the freedom of other nations:

"*Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy*, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 16, 1961, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and freedom.

"*In witness whereof*, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 14th day of July in the year of our Lord 1961, and the independence of the United States of America the 186th.

"By the President:

"(Seal)

"JOHN F. KENNEDY.
"DEAN RUSK,
"Secretary of State."

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1962—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* by a joint resolution approved July 1, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"*Whereas* there exist many historical and cultural ties between the people of these captive nations and the American people; and

"*Whereas* the principles of self-government and human freedom are universal ideals and the common heritage of mankind:

"*Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy*, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 15, 1962, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

"*In witness whereof*, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 13th day of July in the year of our Lord 1962, and of the independence of the United States of America the 187th.

"By the President

"(Seal)

"JOHN F. KENNEDY.
"DEAN RUSK,
"Secretary of State."

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1963—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"*Whereas* the cause of human rights and dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

"*Whereas* justice requires the elemental right of free choice; and

"*Whereas* this Nation has an abiding commitment to the principles of national self-determination and human freedom:

"*Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy*, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

"*In witness whereof*, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 5th day of July in the year of our Lord 1963, and of the independence of the United States of America the 188th.

"By the President:

"(Seal)

"JOHN F. KENNEDY.
"DEAN RUSK,
"Secretary of State."

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1964—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"*Whereas* the cause of human rights and personal dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

"*Whereas* this Nation is firmly committed to the cause of freedom and justice everywhere; and

"*Whereas* it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations:

"*Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson*, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 12, 1964, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

"*In witness whereof,* I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 18th day of June in the year of our Lord 1964, and of the independence of the United States of America the 189th.

"By the President:

"(Seal)

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
"DEAN RUSK,
"*Secretary of State.*"

"CAPTIVE NATIONS' WEEK, 1965—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"*Whereas* all peoples yearn for freedom and justice; and

"*Whereas* these basic rights unfortunately are circumscribed or unrealized in many areas in the world; and

"*Whereas* the United States of America has an abiding commitment to the principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity; and

"*Whereas* it remains a fundamental purpose and intention of the Government and people of the United States of America to recognize and encourage constructive actions which foster the growth and development of national independence and human freedom:

"*Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson,* President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 18, 1965, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

"*In witness whereof,* I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 2nd day of July in the year of our Lord 1965, and of the independence of the United States of America the 190th.

"By the President:

"(Seal)

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
"DEAN RUSK,
"*Secretary of State.*"

THE ABC'S AND SOME BASIC ISSUES

The ABC's of Captive Nations Week go a long way in enabling us to think clearly and responsibly on the issues basic to the security and freedom of our nation. Some of these issues deserve mention here. One is an intelligent, concentrated effort focussed on the fundamental reality of Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. In the U.N. or elsewhere we have done virtually nothing in this fundamental respect. The more the Red totalitarians prattle about "American imperialism," the more millions of minds about the world will believe it. One would think that Goebbels taught us something thirty years ago.

A second basic issue is the formulation of a sensible liberation policy as the best guarantee against both a hot global war and an interminable string of guerrilla wars. This policy, with its almost exclusive emphasis on psycho-political activity and skillful paramilitary engagement, wasn't sufficiently understood in the 50's, and with the re-emerging discussion on "containment" today, not to speak of further communist takeover tomorrow, it stands as the real and winning alternative to the policy of patched-up containment. How unrealistic the proponents of containment are can be gleaned from the evident fact that the Red Syndicate leaped over the Maginot-like containment wall years ago, into Cuba in our hemisphere, into the Middle East, into Africa and Asia. All this through means of calculated, psycho-political warfare, which is even being applied forthrightly in our own country today.

Thirdly, a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations is necessary for obvious symbolic, legislative, and educational reasons. Equally necessary is the establishment of a Freedom Commission and Academy for psycho-political warfare training. Had this been in existence ten years ago, with a do-it-yourself course for foreign nationals, I am convinced that we wouldn't today be sacrificing American lives and treasure in Vietnam. Last-minute recourse to military arms is not the answer to the Red-staged conflict of our day; nor is economic aid and welfare the answer.

Other significant issues are the Consular Convention with the USSR, which should be repudiated by the Senate because it plays into Russian imperio-colonialist hands, and liberalized East-West trade, which should be strongly opposed as a blind repetition of our errors of the 30's and falling into the trap of an over-all Red economic strategy that by now should have been honestly portrayed to our people. Representative Mills of Arkansas has earned the praise of all sober-thinking Americans who refuse to be stampeded into the Syndicate's trap.

THE UNITARY REALITY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

Through all the foggy and murky talk about "East European independence," "the nationalism of Rumanian Communists" and other such ghosts, "containment," "building bridges of understanding" (with whom?), "detente with the Russians," and similar figments of confused minds, there is one massive, unitary reality that cannot be beclouded by these illusions and exercises in self-deception—the captivity of close to a billion people. These are the people who constitute the captive nations. They are in Red states, but they are not of these states.

Our primary appeal, our foremost efforts should be directed toward the freedom of the captive nations, and not the freedom of action of their unrepresentative Red regimes which will always confront us with syndicated action aimed at the expansion of the Red Empire. The mistakes being made today are in great measure a repetition of those committed in yesteryear. Real, progressive change demands revisions of thought, policy, and action; an ever-broadening kowledge of all the captive nations, particularly those in the USSR, propels such change—a change for a more secure peace, expanded freedom, and positive victory in the Cold War.

---

[1] Leonid Brezhnev, Report to 23rd Party Congress, *Pravda*, March 31, 1966.

[2] "Irritating the Bear," *The Washington Post*, July 24, 1959; author's reply, July 29, 1959.

[3] *Izvestia*, July 15, 1964.

[4] Stewart Alsop, "The Berlin Crisis: Khrushchev's Weakness," *Saturday Evening Post*, December 16, 1961.

[5] Lev E. Dobriansky, "Soviet Russian Imperio-Colonialism and the Free World," NATO's Fifteen Nations, September 1963.

[6] Richard M. Nixon, *Six Crises*, 1962, p. 252.

[7] *The Washington Post*, July 24, 1959, p. A 8.

[8] *Associated Press*, Prague, July 24, 1959.

[9] Nikita S. Khrushchev, "On Peaceful Coexistence," *Foreign Affairs, October* 1959, pp. 6–7.

[10] *N. S. Khrushchev's Report to Supreme Soviet*, Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, November 2, 1959, pp. 1–2.

[11] *For the Return to the Homeland*, No. 57/444, August 1960.

[12] Address, U.N. General Assembly, New York, October 4, 1960.

[13] *Pravda*, July 21, 1961.

[14] "Dirty Provocation," *Radyanska Ukraina*, Kiev, July 25, 1961.

[15] *Visti z Ukrainy*, No. 63, August 1961.

[16] *Izvestia*, July 17, 1962.

[17] *The New Times*, Moscow, January 23, 1963.

[18] *Reuters*, Banska Bystrica, Czecho-Slovakia, August 29, 1964.

Enough Clean Water: A Growing National Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. MARSH. Recently, I had occasion to attend the dedication of a new water-treatment facility at Bridgewater, Va., in my congressional district. The construction of this modern treatment plant is a tribute to the citizens of Bridgewater and the leadership of their municipal officials. A great deal of credit for this accomplishment must go to the mayor of that community, C. E. May, who is a professor at Bridgewater College, and to members of the town council, particularly the sewer and water committee.

We frequently overlook the accomplishments achieved by those small communities which undertake major public works programs of this type without advance assurance of substantial financial assistance from the Federal Government. The public service rendered by the leaders of local government is invaluable in such situations, and this facility at Bridgewater is a case in point.

It was most appropriate that a distinguished scientist associated with water research would make the keynote address at the dedication exercises. Dr. David G. Stephan, the speaker, is Chief of the Division of Research of the Water Pollution Control Administration. He brings to that position a rich background of education and experience relating to air pollution and water treatment research that reflect his great knowledge in the field of basic and applied science.

Because of the pertinence of his remarks on water resources, I would like to make available to other Members of the House the speech given by this very capable public servant, as follows:

WATER—VIRGINIA'S PRICELESS RESOURCE

(Address by David G. Stephan, Deputy Chief, Division of Research, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, Department of the Interior, at the dedication of the Bridgewater water treatment plant, Bridgewater, Va., June 26, 1966)

Congressman MARSH, Mayor May, ladies, gentlemen, distinguished guests; Secretary

Udall regrets that he cannot be here with you today, but he has relayed your kind invitation to speak at this dedication ceremony to me. I am particularly pleased and honored to be with you today representing not only Secretary Udall and the Department of the Interior, but also the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration—the very newest Agency to have been created in the Federal Government—an Agency which only last month became a part of the Department of the Interior—and an Agency which in a most direct way personifies the Government's and indeed the public's awakening interest in and concern for the preservation of one of our Nation's most vital assets—water. It is a great pleasure to be here today in the Commonwealth of Virginia in the Shenandoah Valley, particularly during this beautiful season and during an occasion of broad and long-lasting benefit to all of us—the dedication of this new water treatment plant. This plant will not only promote the continued growth and well-being of this area, but will provide a basic life necessity—clear, cool, and clean water.

The need for developing good, usable water supplies is certainly not new to Virginians. Some 350 years ago water was a major concern of Captain Newport when the Susan Constant, the Godspeed, and the Discovery dropped anchor at Jamestown. Apparently, there were no natural springs at the settlement site and early records show that the first settlers tried to draw water from the salty James River but gave up because of the foul taste. From the first, shallow and easily contaminated wells appear to have been the principal source of water for these colonists. Usually, these wells did not provide the so called "sweet water" but at least it was better than river water. A poor drinking water supply is generally accepted by historians as the chief health problem of early Jamestown and it is probable that this was a major factor in the loss of the colony.

But, now, let's talk about water and our country's water resources today. Water is one of the very cheapest materials which you can buy and yet, at the same time, it is priceless. To illustrate, in this country, the average cost of water delivered to the kitchen sink is only 7¢/ton. That's hard to believe compared with the $280/ton we pay for milk; the $100/ton we pay for gasoline; the $20 or $25/ton we pay for coal; or, believe it or not, the $2 or $3/ton we pay for dirt! The phrase "dirt cheap," therefore, is not nearly so meaningful as the phrase "water cheap" and yet, how many of us have ever realized this?

Today, recognition of the value of water as a priceless asset is widespread. President Johnson has stated, "To improve the quality of our waters will require the fullest cooperation of our State and local governments. Working together, we can—and will preserve and increase one of our most valuable national resources—clean water."

Secretary Udall himself has said, "We must learn to respect water. We must recognize that it is an indispensable element of our daily lives. We must increasingly treat water as we do our minerals—as a resource to be sought, recovered, processed, utilized, reclaimed, and reutilized."

And State officials of Virginia have said, "No one will question that water is perhaps Virginia's most valuable natural resource—and, unfortunately, one of the least appreciated."

The "priceless" nature of water is easily understood when one reads of the prospector dying of thirst or the lifeboat passengers with throats so parched they would give their entire possessions for one cup of water. Man can live for months without the sun; he can live for weeks without food; but he can live for only days without water.

How much water does man *need* to live? Under rigorous experimental conditions man can *exist* on only a quart or so of water per day. But how much does man and his society actually use? About 65 gallons are used daily by the average American in his home and about 150 gallons/day are used by a municipality for every person in residence. In addition to these municipal or public water withdrawals, almost 200 gallons/day are withdrawn from rivers, lakes, and wells, by industry for every person in the United States and, if we count the amount of water used by power plants for cooling water in the production of electricity, this total jumps to almost 500 gallons/day per person. Another 500 gallons of river and well water per person is used every day for irrigation of our croplands. These volumes add up to over 250 billion gallons of water used in this country each and every day. Predictions are that by 1980, just fifteen years from now, water usage will jump to over 600 billion gallons/day.

Did you know that up to seventy gallons of water are used in making one gallon of gasoline? Did you know that as much as 150 gallons of water are utilized in the production of a single 5-pound bag of sugar or that 65,000 gallons of water are used to make a ton of steel or a ton of paper? These figures are quite astounding to many people and a question on many lips today is, "are we running out of water?" The fact of the matter is that the amount of rain falling upon the earth stays just about the same from year to year while our population and our industrial usages of water go up and up and up. It should be clear, therefore, that at some point in time, our use of water will equal our available supply and, at that time, our Nation will run out of water. Can you imagine the effect? Industrial growth would be stymied; population pressures stemming from limited water supplies would create a crisis such as we have never seen before; our whole economy would be upset as the price water would command would begin to soar upward and upward. The fact of the matter is that on paper we reached this crisis point in 1957. At that time, our withdrawal rate of fresh water actually exceeded our dependable supply and yet, no *such calamitous water crisis has occurred*. Certainly we have water problems, but we have *not* seen the fulfillment of the many predictions of "water doom" which are based on the argument I have just presented.

The *real* answer is that our Nation, as a whole, is *not* running out of water and *will not* run out of water within the reasonably foreseeable future. The simplest explanation is this: First, neither our water supply nor our water needs are uniformly distributed geographically. Second, neither our water supply nor our water demands are uniformly distributed with time, and third, and most important of all, all of the water withdrawn and used by our cities, by our industries, and by our farms is *not* consumed. Much of it, in fact *most* of it is returned to our fresh water resource for re-use. Recognition of this one simple fact, I believe, will lead to a more realistic understanding of our water problems in this country than any other single thing. The fact that the very same water is being used and re-used on this earth over and over again is almost obvious if you stop to think about it, but very few people have taken time to reflect on the problem in this way. I can prove, for example, that this very glass of water, or in fact, any glass of water that the residents of Bridgewater will draw from the output of this new treatment plant will contain some of the very same molecules of H_2O which were in the Red Sea when Moses crossed from Egypt or which touched Jesus' body when he was baptized in the Jordan. This use and re-use of the world's water supply has been recognized for thousands of years.

In the Bible, for example, Ecclesiastes 1: 7 says, "All the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full; unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again." In modern terms we call this the hydrologic cycle. Rain falls to the earth, runs to the sea, and is evaporated to form rain clouds once again. Re-use of water occurs, however, not only through the hydrologic cycle but as population expands and industry requirements increase, re-use occurs inevitably through an ever-tightening circle of withdrawal, use, discharge, and reuse even while "the rivers run into the sea." It is this recognition of both deliberate and non-deliberate use and re-use which ties together so intimately the problems of water supply and water pollution and which emphasizes so strongly that these problems *cannot* be divorced from one another but rather must be examined and resolved simultaneously through a major coordinated effort by municipalities, by States, by industries, and by the Federal Government working together to give us our vital heritage—clean water at the right place, at the right time, and in the right quantity for all of the beneficial uses of water man should enjoy.

Thank you.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH
OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, this week the Nation is observing Captive Nations Week. Twenty-two separate nationalities have lost their independence in recent decades through direct and indirect aggression of Communist forces. We are now fighting a war to preserve the freedom of another nation against Communist aggression. Although the eyes of the world today are on Asia, we cannot forget the totalitarian rule that still holds in bondage the people of east and central Europe.

Man's yearning for freedom has been a driving force throughout the history of the human race. Those who have once known freedom and lost it realize full well how precious is this inalienable right. The forces of liberty in the captive lands continue to fight Communist tyranny and to look to the free world to help maintain their faith in their struggle for freedom and independence. The people of this country who cherished individual freedom and national liberty as a priceless possession give recognition and observance to the aspirations of these oppressed people. We stand here to reassure them that we remain firm in our policy of self-determination of nations and of individual dignity and justice.

Mr. Speaker, man's yearning for peace cannot be fulfilled until every nation is free to determine its own destiny and until every individual lives in the full knowledge that liberty and justice prevail. Today we bring hope and courage to those still struggling under the yoke of tyranny and new determination to those who remain free to guard their freedom. We hope and pray that the day will soon come when the cause of liberty will triumph—as it must—and all captive people will once more lift their heads as free men.

U.S. Industries Plunge Into Oceanspace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the oceans of the world, covering three-fourths of its surface, are luring 20th century man to their infinite resources and untold riches.

Three to five hundred companies are talking about a new American continent where one day man is expected to live, work, and play.

A recent article in the Buffalo Evening News, "Industries Are Going Underwater for Space Age Profits," delineates the visions of industry, Government, and the academic community for "cities under the sea" on the Continental Shelf. For the United States this means approximately 800,000 square miles of underwater continent.

Many of the Nation's largest industrial giants are participating in this plunge into oceanspace.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

INDUSTRIES ARE GOING UNDERWATER FOR SPACE-AGE PROFITS

(By Rose Allegato)

WASHINGTON, July 9.—A new "ocean consciousness' is luring the 20th-Century corporate man back to the ancient sea.

Visionaires in big business are talking about a new American continent—the sea floor where man can one day work, play and even live.

They are backing their talk of "cities under the sea" with money—a $2 billion investment this year alone in deep-sea pioneering.

Blue chip names in big business are "inner space" disciples who see the ocean bottom as the last frontier to conquer and colonize—the "new world" of this century.

They think the '70s will be their decade, one that will pay off more than a man on the moon.

Industry, government and the academic community envision:

A Lewis-and-Clark kind of expedition of the continental shelf to plant the American flag on the ocean bottom (the continental shelf is the submerged land just off our coasts.)

Prospectors with picks and mechanical burros mining the ocean floor with the same aplomb as their forerunners in the western mountains.

Sailors reporting for duty at defense bases under the sea.

Settlers "homesteading" the higher spots of the seabed along the Atlantic ridge.

In 10 years or so, the world's fresh water supply coming from seawater or artisan (fresh water) wells discovered in the briny deep. (Some have been found off Florida.)

Control of the world's climate through control of ocean currents.

Oil drilling by men living on the ocean floor.

Just as the ocean beckoned to businessmen in the middle ages, it beckons now. The National Association of Manufacturers says 300 to 500 top companies are getting their feet wet in the modern rush to the sea.

Industry's interest—it puts up from 50 to 70% of the money invested in sea pioneering—is giving status to oceanography.

No one knows better than the oil industry, which began offshore exploration as early as the mid-'30s, that there is a fortune undersea.

Dr. Charles F. Jones, president of Humble Oil Co., says the seas offer food, minerals, and energy in profusion.

He points out that three-quarters of the earth is covered by water and it is "essentially unexplored and untouched."

Jones thinks we may be facing "an international underwater treasure hunt with the winner's share going to the country with the best sea science."

At a 1958 Geneva conference, the United States and other countries were assigned title to their own continental shelves. For the U.S. this means an underwater continent of 800,000 square miles. Not as much land has been added to the United States since the Louisiana purchase of 1803.

But beyond the shelf, the nation's that get there first and dig in will probably reap the sea's wealth.

Specifically, to conquer the sea, man must fathom its depths, down to 35,958 feet, the bottom of the deepest undersea trench, Challenger Deep in the pacific.

The handiest seabeds, and the most valuable, are the continental shelves.

These submarine plains lie within the first thousand feet. They are only 10% of the ocean bottom. Yet they have half of the ocean's biological population and most of its commercially valuable minerals. They will probably be explored and settled first.

The Navy's Sealab II has reached 205 feet off La Jolla, Calif. Men, including astronaut Scott Carpenter, lived and worked in the undersea chamber for 45 days. In the spring of 1967, Sealab III will go down to 400 feet. It will be a prelude to a more ambitious "home-in-the-sea," called the Habitat. By 1969 or 1970, the Navy hopes to put the Habitat down at 600 feet and leave it there.

Like counterpart space platforms, the Habitat would be a jumping off spot for astronauts. With a small sub, stored in the Habitat, they would make voyages to the bottom of the sea.

Hannes Keller has left a diving bell at 1000 feet for less than a minute for an oceanspace "first."

Another 15% of the sea-floor lies within the first 6000 feet. Most of America's small subs, built either by government or private industry, operate here. The Aluminaut, made by Reynolds Aluminum, and one of the craft that raised the H-bomb off Spain, holds the "deep record." It has been down to 6250 feet and is built for 15,000 feet.

Most of the ocean floor lies between 6000 to 20,000 feet. Called the unknown world of innerspace, it has been penetrated by man only a very few times. (The Bathyscaphe Trieste and a two-man crew went into Challenger Deep in 1960.)

By the end of 1967, the Navy hopes to begin on a deep-diving research sub that will eventually put us 20,000 feet under the sea.

The Navy and Atomic Energy Commission are teaming up to develop NR–1, a sub that could sit on the ocean floor for long periods of time. It would be equipped with a small nuclear propulsion plant. Where do we stand on developing the sea's wealth. Here's a thumbnail look.

Minerals: We now get all of our magnesium and much of our bromine from the sea. Sulphur and coal also have been taken from the ocean. Tin is the next big development. Important lodes have been found off the United Kingdom and Malaysa. Six companies are prospecting for platinum off Alaska and showing their samples. There is gold, copper, and even diamonds.

Oil: Offshore oil exploration began three decades ago and now the industry is convinced that one-sixth of the proven oil reserves lie under the sea. Offshore oil fields in the free world are producing over 4,000,000 barrels of oil a day or 16% of the free world's total. This industry has made more profit from ocean than any other.

Seafood: Fishing is as old as history, but now, fishermen will go after fish of types man has never tasted.

Who are the industrial giants taking the dip into oceanspace?

U.S. Steel, which has established a research division to develop and test super-strong steel that could withstand the tremendous pressures of the deep.

Lockheed has established a marine laboratory and is developing Deep Quest, a sub to operate a mile down.

Westinghouse is building a new research and test facility, adding highly sophisticated diving support systems to its torpedo and sonar business.

General Electric and General Dynamics have entered the field. General Dynamics built a two-man sub called Asherah.

Union Carbide, General Precision, and Edwin A. Link have teamed up to form Ocean Systems Inc., which will manufacture diving support systems and provide divers.

Brown & Root is putting its know-how in offshore oil engineering to work in the Mohole-ocean-bottom coring project to penetrate the earth's mantle.

Reynolds Aluminum launched its deep-sea sub Aluminaut in 1964, and Aluminum Co. of America is producing aluminum spheres designed to protect delicate instruments below the surface.

No one expects the new surge to slow down, mainly because there's money to be made undersea.

Captive Nations Observance

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, again this Nation and freedom-loving people everywhere join in observing Captive Nations Week. I feel honored to again have the opportunity to join in this observance.

Today we are fighting in southeast Asia to preserve the rights of a people to their sovereignty and to live under a government of their own choosing. While this fight is going on with military weapons of war, there is a quiet but persistent fight of many people to again obtain the freedom to which they are entitled. I refer to the many countries, the captive nations, now under the yoke of communism which came about by forceable action on the part of the Soviets. These nations look to us for support in their unceasing quest for self-determination.

As we live up to our commitments in southeast Asia, we are in effect reaffirming to all nations the fact that a pledge by the United States will be honored.

As we stand against the spread of communism in southeast Asia, we give courage to the courageous people of the captive nations in their determination to stand free of the tyranny of that ideology.

While we set aside this one week of the year to renew our pledges of support for these nations, we must keep them in the forefront of our minds and in our deeds throughout the year continue our efforts in their behalf.

Captive Nations Week, 1966

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the eighth annual response to a unanimous resolution of the 86th Congress, the President has designated this week as Captive Nations Week.

The United States is justly concerned with the aggressive efforts of the Communists throughout the world today, but far too little attention is given to those countries who have already been caught in the constricting vice of Communist oppression. Captive Nations Week duly focuses on those countries who formerly had their own form of government and whose people have since been unwillingly subjugated by the Communists; this deplorable situation, of course, exists not only in Eastern Europe, but also in Cuba, a number of territories now enclosed within the U.S.S.R., and many areas of Asia. Through the various ceremonies and activities scheduled for this week, Americans will again display their dedication to the reachievement of personal dignity, freedom, and independence by these peoples.

The objective of Captive Nations Week is thus to demonstrate the American determination that Communist subjugation is never to be recognized as a permanent situation; the resistance of the courageous peoples in dominated countries and of their valiant relatives and friends elsewhere cannot go unaided or unassisted.

Therefore, it is in a spirit of encouragement and action that we should observe Captive Nations Week, recognizing the duty of the free world to release the bonded from their captivity under despotism. We are in pursuit of freedom; and we shall not lose.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to express my support for the aims of the Captive Nations Week observance. I consider it a deep tragedy that at a time when colonial empires all over the world have virtually disappeared, the colonial status imposed by communism has retained its grip over the lives of more than a hundred million souls. Following events in Eastern and Central Europe today, one is almost led to believe that genuine freedom and justice does exist. However, this is certainly not the case, and we must make certain that the world knows the truth of Communist deception.

By the end of World War II, Soviet Russia was well on the way to becoming a great power, and at the same time, she was demonstrating attitudes as barbaric and negative as those of the Nazis who had just been defeated. Few acts perpertrated by the Soviets were as blatant and loathsome as was the capture and enslavement of the large number of East European nations. That was, and remains to this day, a most shocking and heart-rending case of international banditry.

Prior to the war these nations had constituted independent, sovereign states in their respective lands with a culture and past of their own. As a result of the war, and in its wake, all of them were quickly overwhelmed by the Red army, and then gradually enslaved as satellites of the Soviet Union.

The fate of these people must be of vital concern to each of us. We must do all in our power to encourage and hasten the day when these people will join us in working for a better world in which to work and live.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

National Petroleum Council Excellent Example of Government-Industry Cooperation in the Public Interest—Hon. Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, Commends the Council for 20 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 22, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in May 1946, the President of the United States, by letter to the Secretary of the Interior, stated that he had been impressed wih the meaningful contributions of Government-industry cooperation in the success of the World War II petroleum program. He commented on the importance of such close and harmonious relations between the Government and the petroleum industry, and emphasized his belief that it should be continued.

Accordingly, President Truman suggested that the Secretary of the Interior establish an industry organization to consult with and advise the Department on oil and gas matters. Pursuant to this direction, the National Petroleum Council was established by the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. J. A. Krug, on June 18, 1946.

In honor of the 20th anniversary of its establishment the Council held a dinner last Monday evening, July 18, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C. Guests included members of the Council, congressional and governmental leaders, and oil and gas industry officials. West Virginia is an important oil and gas producing State, and I was pleased to be present on this important occasion.

The purpose of the Council is solely to advise, inform, and make recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior or the Director of the Office of Oil and Gas with respect to matters which relate to the industry, and which are submitted to the Council or approved by the Secretary or Director.

Its members are appointed each fiscal year by the Secretary of the Interior. Membership is drawn from all segments of the petroleum and natural gas industries, from the production phase to the retail marketing level. It is wholly supported by the voluntary contributions received from members.

The Council is headed by a Chairman and Vice Chairman, and the Secretary of the Interior serves as a Cochairman.

Mr. President, I am pleased to note that the first Chairman of the National Petroleum Council was the Honorable Walter S. Hallanan, of Charleston, W. Va. Mr. Hallanan, a cherished friend, served in this responsible post for the first 16 years of the Council's existence, and made many contributions in bringing it to the present level of responsive and effective action.

From 1962–64 the Council was headed by R. G. Follis, chief executive officer of Standard Oil of California. Mr. Follis was succeeded by Jake L. Hamon, an independent oil producer from Dallas, Tex., who was honored at the July 18 dinner. He was presented a citation by former Assistant Secretary of the Interior John M. Kelly. The citation expressed the appreciation of Council members for Mr. Hamon's outstanding service and leadership.

Now serving as Council Chairman, having been elected at a meeting on July 19, is James C. Donnell II, president of Marathon Oil Co.

Mr. President, there were two speakers at the anniversary dinner. Carl E. Reistle, Jr., former chairman of the board of Humble Oil & Refining Co., urged closer communication between leaders of government and industry. He pointed out that this interchange of ideas has been instrumental in building a 20-year record of effective action between the Council and the Department of Interior.

Hon. Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, responded for Government. The Secretary expressed appreciation to the Council for its substantial assistance over the years. He point out that we must have the closest liaison and cooperative effort between Government and industry if we are to meet the challenges of a highly industrialized society.

It is also noteworthy that the former Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, was in attendance on this occasion, and was received warmly. He pioneered in the Government-industry concept.

Mr. President, the Council is a continuing means through which the American Government and our oil and gas industries can work jointly in promoting long-term national security and emergency preparedness. During its life the Council has prepared at the request of the Department of the Interior more than 160 detailed studies on the complex operations of the petroleum industry. The problems examined fall into four categories: supplies of crude oil, natural gas, and petroleum products; facilities for producing, refining, transporting, and storing oil and gas; advance planning and preparations by the Government and industry for possible national emergencies; and specialized informational and advisory studies.

I commend the National Petroleum Council and congratulate its members for lasting contributions to the public welfare. It is an excellent example of the positive results which can be achieved through a working partnership between our Federal Government and the private sector of the economy.

I request that the address of Hon. Stewart L. Udall, at the July 18, 1966, meeting of the National Petroleum Council be printed in the Appendix, together with the text a citation presented to Jake L. Hamon on that occasion.

There being no objection, the address and citation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE STEWART L. UDALL, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE NATIONAL PETROLEUM COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 19, 1966

I would like to begin my remarks with a quotation from a distinguished writer and city planner about a current problem: "If atmospheric sewage was the first mark of paleotechnic industry, stream pollution was the second. The dumping of industrial and chemical waste products into the streams was a characteristic mark of the new order. Wherever the factories went, the streams became foul and poisonous; the fish died or were forced, like the Hudson shad, to migrate, and the water became unfit for either drinking or bathing. In many cases the refuse so wantonly disposed of was in fact capable of being used; but the whole method of industry was so shortsighted and so unscientific that the full utilization of by-products did not concern anyone for the first century or so. What the streams could not transport away remained in piles and hillocks on the outskirts of the industrial plant, unless it could be used to fill in the watercourses or the swamps on the new sites of the industrial city."

Does all this sound like something you read in the Magazine section of the New York Times last week? It isn't. This was Lewis Mumford, writing in 1930 about a condition that had attended the very birth of Western industrial society, and which has steadily worsened in direct proportion to the growth of what Mumford aptly called "carboniferous capitalism."

My point is simply that the problem of environmental pollution is not new. The new feature in the story is the encouraging fact that under President Johnson's leadership we have finally recognized that we do have a problem—a national problem—and that we must find a solution as the condition for our continued survival. This is a strong statement. I believe it. I believe that we must restore our air and our water resources to some tolerable state of purity or we shall as a nation surely suffocate in our own effluvia.

For nearly three hundred and sixty years we have been steadily building a nation, organizing and exploiting an incredible inventory of natural resources to make ourselves the richest, most powerful people the world has ever known. We have buildings that rise a thousand feet into the air; planes that span the continent in four hours; automobiles—nearly one for every two people—that transport the average American family farther in an hour than George Washington could travel in a week—and in air-conditioned comfort to boot. We have poured out of our horn of plenty a flood of devices to ease the burdens of housewife and mill worker alike. This year we shall increase our gross national product in real terms by over $40 billion over that of 1965. No people on earth ever had more in the way of material comforts and conveniences; and no people on earth ever had to put forth less physical toil to enjoy them.

We have come this far in only three centuries. We are indeed an affluent society.

But as you fly at 600 miles an hour toward any one of several of our major cities, the first thing that tells you of its presence is likely to be a pall of yellow haze that floats like a blanket between the city and the blue sky.

In the largest of these cities last summer you had to ask for a glass of water to go with your dinner. The waitress risked a fine if she provided it without your specific order. In other cities the aroma of rotten cabbage and the sour taste on your tongue tell you of the proximity of a pulp mill or a chemical plant. In a hundred valleys of the Appalachians the corrosive leachings from coal mines poison the streams and everything in them. In the Great Lakes area, rivers warm to the touch, and loaded with human and industrial waste, threatens to make a second Dead Sea of Lake Erie, and seriously menace the lower portion of Lake Michigan. On our own doorstep you can admire the quiet beauty of the Potomac. But if you should fall into it, your wisest action would be to go get a typhoid shot.

We have come this far, too, in only three centuries. We are also an effluent society.

The truth is that there is a direct connection between affluence and effluents. Our material opulence is the product of an enormous conversion of natural resources to human use, accomplished through the interaction of technology and energy upon the raw products of the land. The inevitable byproduct of this massive conversion is a vast amount of waste material which has no apparent economic use and which has to be disposed of in some manner. Our traditional way of disposing of the fluid portion of these wastes has been to pump it into the air or into the closest watercourse in the hope that a forgiving Mother Nature would somehow take care of it for us. And for many generations, she did. But no more. There are now so many of us, and our capacity to create pollutants is now so extensive that we can no longer trust the assimilative capacity of our air and water to absorb the unwanted residue of our industrial society.

We are very late in recognizing the seriousness of the problem we have creafed for ourselves, in no small measure because of the fugitive nature of our air and water resources. It was a simple matter to vent pollutants into the air or the nearby river, knowing that the next day they would be gone, borne away by the currents of wind and water. And all too few were troubled by the fact that they had simply moved their problem downstream a few miles, there to vex the lives of their riparian neighbors. Both authority and responsibility were fragmented along the course of our Nation's major streams, with the result that all could degrade and abuse them, and none could raise an effective voice of protest against what was taking place.

Slowly—very slowly—our Nation began to awaken to the fact that a river that extends for a thousand miles through a dozen states and a hundred municipalities cannot be adequately protected by any authority below that of the Federal government. The first official recognition of this truth came with the passage of the Water Pollution Control Act in 1948—the first to pass of more than 100 anti-pollution bills that have been introduced in Congress in the preceding 60 years. Although the law had no great impact, at least it represented a victory over the forces that have so consistently and successfully opposed Federal entry into this particular area.

In the years since 1948 public awareness of water pollution problems became more perceptive and the demands for their solution more insistent. But it was not until President Johnson rallied the Nation to full understanding and acceptance of the great efforts needed to correct the situation that real progress began to be made.

In Feburary of 1965 the President sent to Congress his now famous message on Natural Beauty. In it was included an assignment to me, to take the leadership in devising a clean-up program for the Potomac River. His language was blunt and clear: "Clean up the river and keep it clean, so it can be used for boating, swimming, and fishing."

Eight months later, at a ceremony at the White House, the President elaborated on his clean-up order. In equally blunt and clear terms, he deplored the use of rivers as pipelines for toxic wastes. And then he said:

"This sort of carelessness and selfishness simply ought to be stopped; and more, it must be reversed. And we are going to reverse it. We are going to begin right here in Washington with the Potomac River . . . with the signing of the Water Quality Act of 1965 this morning, I pledge you that we are going to reopen the Potomac for swimming in 1975. And within the next 25 years we are going to repeat this effort in lakes and streams and other rivers across this country."

In Feburary of this year, the President announced a reorganization plan to transfer to the Department of the Interior the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, which was then under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Last May 10 this transfer became effective. It was, as I said at the time, a "red-letter" day in my five and a half years as Secretary. The legislative authority and the administrative structure are now available for an effective attack upon the formidable problems of water pollution at a truly national level.

As a result of the Water Quality Act, we of the Federal establishment find ourselves in a new role. The water quality standards afford us an opportunity to extend our nationwide effort beyond mere correction and into the area of prevention. The battle for better environment thus moves from a rearguard action to a forward attack. The task is no longer just to clean up yesterday's mess, but to prevent tomorrow's from occurring at all.

The guidelines to the States have been established pursuant to the authority contatinted in the Act, and the response has been uniformly satisfactory. I have even detected a note of relief that the troublesome task of insuring equitable application of water quality standards is to be shouldered by the Federal government.

These standards will take into consideration several factors. One of particular interest to refiners and petrochemical manufacturers is your competitive position with relation to plants in other regions. In recognition of this problem, the Federal position is a reasonable one. It takes account of the economic feasibility of water quality requirements and sets up hearing procedures by which affected industries may state their cases for modification of proposed standards. We want to have full knowledge beforehand of what the likely effects of our contemplated actions will be. We do not intend for our enforcement practices to be hasty or ill-advised. We do intend for them to be effective.

In this national water clean-up effort we ned—we welcome—your help. Water and oil may not mix, but they certainly have a lot to do with one another. I was amazed to learn recently of the tremendous volumes of water—most of it saline—that oil producers must dispose of in the course of their operations: 24 million barrels of it a day; a million barrels every hour; 3 barrels of water for every barrel of crude oil produced. I was also gratified by the manner in which your industry, working with State conservation authorities, is dealing with the problem: the protection of fresh groundwater strata by drilling, casing, completion and abandonment procedures which insure that no brines or other contaminants are allowed to leak into fresh water aquifers; the reinjection of saline water into oil reservoirs to stimulate recovery—a double dividend for conservation; and the steady reduction of the amount of salt water being disposed of in surface pits. The oil industry's record of brine disposal is one of encouraging progress. But in 1963, over 2½ million barrels a day of salt waer was still going into unlined pits and another million was going into streams and rivers. You still have a way to go, but your willingness and ability to progress in this area have been demonstrated, and you need only to press to a conclusion the excellent programs you now have under way.

Oil processing operations also use huge amounts of water, with the possibility that the water returned to the streamflow may be contaminated by oil droplets, or by chemical wastes, even though in minuscule concentrations. The oil industry has done much in the past to reduce the frequency and extent of such occurrences, and the very large sums of money the refining segment has spent, and is spending, for the abatement of air and water pollution is a testament to the importance you attach to this effort. The cooperation of the refiners in the Chicago area in working with Federal, State and local officials in the effort to save Lake Michigan is another example of responsible civic action. Your initiative is appreciated. Your continued active support of and participation in pollution abatement actions is solicited.

Nobody expects the clean-up program to be cheap. Last year the people of New York State voted four to one for a billion dollar bond issue to clean up their rivers. And many more billions must be paid by other citizens in other parts of the country before we can begin to see the kind of results we are aiming for. What makes the programs appear so costly to us now is the fact that for a hundred years we have been skimping on the essential and legitimate costs of our material abundance. We have not been paying full fare. We have failed to face up to the fact that the cost of clean-up, the cost of restoring the landscape for other uses, the cost of properly disposing of waste on a current basis, are all properly chargeable items in the price we should have been paying for our goods and services for many years gone by.

From now on we shall not only have to pay the current costs of these items, but we shall have to amortize the deferred charges of the past several decades as well. It is quite a load. But there is no reason for the most prosperous nation in the world to give off the look and smell of the shabbiest. We can surely create an environment worthy of our wealth, our talents, and our technical skill. We can have again the clean air, the clear streams, the sparkling lakes, the white unblemished beaches that have been so largely lost to us through generations of shortsightedness and neglect.

We meet on the common ground of concern for our environment. From each of our sectors of society must come a sincere effort to improve the quality of that environment. Working together in a spirit of cooperation and understanding, I know we can succeed.

PRESENTED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL PETROLEUM COUNCIL TO JAKE L. HAMON ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

In grateful appreciation for his outstanding leadership as Chairman of the National Petroleum Council, 1964–1966.

As a charter member of the Council, he has continued to serve this organization for 18 years. He has actively participated in over 20 major study committees of this Council, and has been a member of its Agenda Committee since 1961.

Through his abiding belief in the value of the National Petroleum Council, together with his complete dedication to its purposes, Jake L. Hamon exemplifies the principle that the American oil and gas industries can and should cooperate at all times with the Government of the United States in the interest of this Nation and its people.

Throughout his life Jake L. Hamon has worked diligently to serve the petroleum industry, of which he is a most vibrant part, through positions of utmost responsibility which he has so faithfully fulfilled. Yet he has not confined his energies solely to the oil industry, but has also given of himself unstintingly toward the betterment of his community, state and country.

The Members of the National Petroleum Council, by this Citation, wish to express to their associate, Jake L. Hamon, their deep appreciation for his warm friendship, for his devotion to those sound principles in which he believes, and love of his fellow man. Let it be known, therefore, that we, the Members of the National Petroleum Council, regard Jake Hamon as a good friend, and respect him as a true gentleman, an industry statesman, and a great American.

Presented this 18th day of July, 1966, in the City of Washington in the District of Columbia.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in commemorating the observance of the Captive Nations Week.

Two decades have passed since the Allied victory in World War II, but millions of people in Eastern and Central Europe are still awaiting the day when they will be able to exercise fully their right to self-determination.

In all of those countries—from Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia on the north, to little Albania on the south—freedom has not been made secure. Ruled by Communist regimes, the people of those countries are denied the opportunity to shape the destinies of their nations in a manner consistent with our Western tradition. Neither are they able to exercise their basic human rights—even in instances where such rights as freedom of conscience, of speech, and so on, are ostensibly guaranteed to them by their constitutions.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has conducted hearings relating to the conditions in Eastern and Central Europe. The record of those hearings amply documents the plight of those people and exposes the hypocrisy of Communist professions of respect for the dignity and worth of all human beings.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress and our Chief Executives have for years observed this Captive Nations Week. The whole purpose of this observance is to focus attention on conditions prevailing in Eastern and Central Europe and to reaffirm our refusal to accept them as permanent.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing our hope that the day will soon come when the people of such countries as Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and of all the other countries currently dominated by communism, will once again enjoy the full blessings of freedom.

"Planned Noise" and Aircraft Noise—A Whimsical Interview

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, Washington's political pundit Art Buchwald, paid a visit to New York City recently and reported on one aspect of his observations of my hometown. He reported,, in the Sunday, July 10, 1966, edition of the Washington Post that he visited the central office of the "Planned Noise Organization," which, he said, "has the contract for making New York one of the noisiest cities in the country."

Observer Buchwald interviewed the head of the company and was shown a map, with various colors designating degrees of noise in the city. "The red areas are where we have made our greatest impact," the company president said.

While the "planned noise" company's president admitted there are parts of Queens and Staten Island which are still "virgin territory," the group has successfully instilled in parts of Queens a certain decible-consciousness.

Mr. Buchwald asked:

> I noticed there are sections of Queens that are marked in red. What did you do there?

The planned noise company president declared:

> That was one of our toughest jobs.
>
> We didn't have enough jackhammers or garbage trucks to do a decent job in Queens, but we had something else in our favor. We found out that the jet planes landing at LaGuardia and Kennedy were making their approaches to the airports over water. So we arranged with the airlines to have the jets make their approaches over the densely populated areas at night, and now we not only keep people awake in Queens but in parts of Brooklyn and Nassau County as well.

Although I am sure that "planned noise" is not as real as the planned music of Muzak, Mr. Buchwald's observation do point to the need for further research and development of aircraft noise controls—both mechanical and regulatory. While noise restrictions should not exist at the expense of air travel safety, I am convinced that there can be further reduction of aircraft noise so that citizens of areas in Queens and others living near airports can be spared this sonic nuisance.

Following is Mr. Buchwald's column:

MACBETH AT LARGE—CLEVER ORGANIZATION MURDERS SLEEP NIGHTLY IN NEW YORK

(By Art Buchwald)

NEW YORK.—It's hard to believe that noise in a major city is accidental. Most noise these days is planned and there are even companies who specialize in it. One such company is located in New York City and is known as the Planned Noise Organization. It has the contract for making New York one of the noisiest cities in the country.

I interviewed the president of the PNO in his luxurious offices on Sixth Avenue. He showed me a map of the five boroughs.

"The different colors on the map," he said, "stand for the success or failure we've had in our noise campaign. The red areas are where we have made our greatest impact. There people get an average of four hours sleep a night. The blue areas are where we have made some inroads, but unfortunately people still get six hours sleep a night. The green areas over here in Staten Island and parts of Queens are virgin territory which we haven't gotten around to yet. Residents there still get eight hours sleep a night, but they won't for long."

"How do you manage to make a place noisy?" I asked him.

"We have many ways of doing it. Let's take 56th Street for example. For quite some time it was a very quiet street and the city was making very little headway in keeping the people awake. So they hired us. The first thing we did was to start digging up the streets at six in the morning on the pretense that it had to be paved.

"We did this for several weeks, but the people started to complain, so we had to come up with something more permanent. We discovered that the garbage trucks on 56th Street were making their pick-ups at 10 o'clock in the morning. Therefore we revised their schedule so they would start picking up and grinding garbage at 4:30 in the morning."

"That's wonderful," I said. "I notice there are sections of Queens that are marked in red. What did you do there?"

"That was one of our toughest jobs. We didn't have enough jackhammers or garbage trucks to do a decent job in Queens, but we had something else in our favor. We found out that the jet planes landing at LaGuardia and Kennedy were making their approaches to the airports over water. So we arranged with the airlines to have the jets make their approaches over the densely populated areas at night, and now we not only keep people awake in Queens, but in parts of Brooklyn and Nassau County as well."

"Do you ever use automobile horns in your work?"

"We have on occasion started honking horns in a quiet section late at night, but it hasn't had any lasting effect. We'd much prefer to use police sirens and fire engines or to get a group of teenagers and give them a free case of beer around two in the morning.

"But those are only special jobs," he said. "For the long pull, the best way to keep people from sleeping is to arrange to tear down a building next to them or build a subway under their street."

"That must require quite a bit of funds," I said.

"Money has never been a problem when it comes to keeping people in New York awake. But in the past it's been a hit or miss proposition. With our planning organization we will be able to make every part of the city as noisy as every other part. Our goal for 1970 is to cut the average amount of sleep of each person down to two hours a night—if they're lucky, that is."

Government by Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 22, 1966

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the

Congress and the Nation a fine editorial entitled "Government by Law," which appeared in the Wednesday, July 13, 1966, issue of the Aiken Standard and Review, Aiken, S.C. This editorial is a succinct statement on the grave situation existing in this country today where we are seeing demonstrations and intimidations threaten our system of laws.

I ask unanimous consent that this article appear in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT BY LAW

A danger in the United States today is that demonstrations and intimidations will replace government by orderly, legal process.

It is very difficult to draw a line, in opposition to peaceful demonstrations. During the sit-in vogue, with a minority seeking goals most Americans were in sympathy with, many were nevertheless disturbed that crowds were allowed to enter a private place of business, sit in all chairs or on all stools, disrupt the business completely—the owner having no access to law or protection.

Many people are in sympathy with the goals of the leaders of some marches. But again, when thousands converge on a small rural town, some shouting such things as: "We want white blood now," it is almost certain to cause ill feeling at the last, and to do as much harm as good.

Of course, there are injustices on the other side perhaps outweighing the excesses of marchers but that is not the question. The question is how we can achieve lasting progress. One must question incorrect methods, or the taking of the law into one's own hands, though few politicians seem to do so. Now that the Communist Party has announced, as of June 24th, that its members will join the civil rights marchers and demonstrators, it seems that things could get out of hand.

There has been great progress by reliance on government by law and change by the due and legal process. Minorities in this country enjoy better living conditions and greater opportunities than anywhere else in the world. And change and new laws have been rapidly forthcoming. All Americans have much to be thankful for, and all should avoid extreme actions or counteractions.

Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on June 23 the House approved the allied health professions personnel training amendments, which authorize a 3-year program of Federal assistance to schools and students of the allied health professions. It passed unanimously; 364 to 0. I was proud to record my vote in favor of this forward-looking and urgently needed bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Senate will act quickly on this measure. There is no question of partisanship—only one of health.

The allied health professions personnel training amendments is one of the three major proposals of President Johnson's health message this year. In combination with the others—one to strengthen our attack upon the obsolescence of hospitals and other health facilities; and another to stimulate the development of comprehensive public health services—it will permit the Nation to move ahead in its efforts to insure, for all its people, the benefits of an unsurpassed medical capability.

The final enactment of H.R. 13196 is essential. In this decade of the 1960's, the Nation's shortages of health manpower have for the first time received the congressional attention they so long demanded. With the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act and the Nurse Training Act, we have made possible a long overdue expansion of the training capacity of our professional schools. We have taken an important step toward assuring the quality and quantity of highly trained doctors, dentists, and nurses required by our national goals in health.

But health care is very much a team effort today. The team includes our physicians and dentists, our home health aids and practical nurses, our medical technologists and hospital administrators. I am happy that we are at last moving to assure that the needed allied health professions workers will be available.

A major gap has existed in what should be a comprehensive training effort—until now, with the hope of the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act becoming law, there has been no attempt to deal with the allied health professions. The allied health professions encompass some 30 occupations, each one vital to modern health services. Some of their members—medical record librarians, X-ray technologists—provide services essential to the operation of our hospitals and health facilities. Others—dental hygienists, for example—render health services under the supervision of more highly trained members of the health team.

Baccalaureate level training in the allied health professions is offered by colleges and universities throughout the country. And a growing number of junior colleges are preparing students for careers in certain allied professions through associate degree programs. Our manpower needs are so great that we must take advantage of all existing opportunities for training, and I was delighted that the bill, as reported from committee, and as passed by the House, will permit Federal assistance to both baccalaureate and associate degree programs.

For just seven of the allied health professions—dental hygiene, medical record library service, medical technology, occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech pathology and audiology, and X-ray technology, manpower estimates indicate the necessity for more than doubling our current manpower by 1975. To reach this goal, schools in the fields will have to graduate annually before 1975—twice as many medical X-ray technologists as they are now doing; twice as many speech pathologists and audiologists; three or four times as many dental hygienists. There must be even greater increases in the numbers of workers trained in such occupations as medical record library service and physical therapy.

H.R. 13196 will provide major support in reaching this goal. Through grants, it will aid colleges, universities, and junior colleges in expanding and modernizing their teaching facilities and in improving their educational programs. Through traineeships for advanced training, it will prepare members of these professions for teaching, supervision, and administration. The shortage of teachers is a major block to still larger training programs. This bill, in addition, looks to the future of education in the allied health professions by encouraging the development of new types of health technologists and technicians.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and its distinguished chairman, should be commended for its most thoughtful consideration of this measure which is so important to the welfare of our country.

The health sciences move forward with every passing day. As they do, their potential benefits for the improved health of our people grow ever larger.

Medical science promises the rehabilitation to productive lives of the victims of accidents and strokes and heart attacks. It has made possible the early detection of such diseases as cancer and glaucoma—and the prevention of death and disability. To assure the full benefits of our great scientific advances to all who need them, there must be technologists and technicians to provide specialized services, to administer and process diagnostic tests.

Mr. Speaker, the action of the House on June 23 was a much needed step. We are at a crossroad. Our national commitment is a broad one—to provide the best possible health care to every citizen. Medicare and other new programs will make medical and hospital services accessible to many millions of Americans who have been unable to afford good medical care. Our great scientific advances are making medical diagnosis and treatment both more complex and more costly. Thus, even as we progress we have only begun—there must be changes in organization for the delivery of health care. There must be new and better kinds of facilities. And they cannot be delayed.

I am sure that all of my colleagues share my concern, and that they will continue to support the legislation we need to underwrite our promise of good health for all America.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 49 years since communism won its first victory by overthrowing the Kerensky government in Russia. Since then Communists have seized power in Eastern Europe, parts of Asia, and most recently Cuba. Nowhere have the Communists come to power through free elections. Force and violence have been the hallmark of their success. The Congress which is elected by freemen has taken note of these misdeeds and others in the captive nations resolution of the 86th Congress and since then during Captive Nations Week.

We hope that things are getting better, that the era of suppression is passing. Still we read that the Lutheran Church is being prevented from holding its convocation in East Germany. The Polish Catholic hierarchy is being challenged by the Communist government as it attempts to celebrate the 1,000th anniversary of Poland's conversion to Christianity and Poland's birth as a nation.

In the Soviet Union itself, dissenting writers are being suppressed as illustrated by the trials held recently for two authors who dared to criticize the regime in their works.

These are but a few recent examples of how freedom is still being suppressed. We in the West know of them only because they involved famous people or large organizations. The plight of the common man is probably just as great for he is caught in conflicts between his inner strivings to be free and the world in which he must live.

Mr. Speaker, we can hope that someday these people will be able to live in a world which will not suppress their desire to be free. Until that day we shall demonstrate through actions such as the proclamation of Captive Nations Week that we know of their plight and desire as much as they do to see a world which knows only freedom for all of its inhabitants.

Disclosures of the Week—Part X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the usual number of unpleasant news items and other shocking bits of information came to my attention this past week. Among these were the following:

CASE I

Herb Robinson, associate editor of the Seattle Times, revealed a new item of Federal largesse. In his column recently he told of Project Public Information financed by Federal funds involving a mobile study which will travel throughout Alaska and the Pacific Northwest. It will produce documentary films, television news clips and articles to build the image of public schools. Critics call this unit a propaganda wagon. The cost to the taxpayers—$153,000.

CASE II

The Wall Street Journal of July 15, 1966, in a report by Bryce Porter says things are worse than ever in Harlem and getting worse all the time. The poverty program, he says, does far more harm than good.

CASE III

It was disclosed last week that the Department of Justice dismissed an antitrust suit against the Anheuser-Busch Co. of St. Louis less than 30 days after the firm's top executives contributed a total of $10,000 to the President's Club.

CASE IV

Congressman GERALD R. FORD, speaking of the urgent need for reform in the field of political finances said all who are interested in the integrity of the election process will be grieved that Congress is dragging its feet in considering bills to effect long-overdue reforms.

CASE V

Prof. F. Benham of the London School of Economics made a study of underdeveloped nations. He decided that to raise the more than 1 billion inhabitants of backward nations to a modest income level of $200 each per year would require $83 billions of foreign aid a year. This estimate was made in 1961. Writer Walter Trohan of the Chicago Tribune says the cost today would be $100 billion per year.

CASE VI

According to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States strikes idled more workers during the first quarter of this year than in any similar period over the last 11 years.

CASE VII

The U.S. chamber also says it has analyzed 12 Great Society programs and found spending is up 258 percent since 1964 for these programs.

CASE VIII

Lyn Shepard, staff correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor gave the latest political whodunit. He noted that on July 12, 1966, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY flew to St. Louis in a plane furnished by Anheuser-Busch. President Busch arranged this so the Vice President could throw out the first ball at any all-star baseball game.

He later addressed a luncheon of major party contributors. The head of the Justice Department's antitrust division and son accompanied Mr. HUMPHREY and flew back with him to Washington.

CASE IX

Columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott have pointed out that Sargent Shriver has $2.5 billion to spend in the poverty war.

The columnists' report says it goes without saying that the Democrats will take the utmost advantage of these funds to improve their uncertain election prospects.

School Desegregation in the North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 22, 1966

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the July 7, 1966, edition of the Anderson Free Press, Anderson, S.C., there appeared an editorial entitled "Northern Segregation." The editorial makes some excellent points on school desegregation and particularly as regards the development in this area which has taken place in many of the larger cities in the North.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial appear in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHERN SEGREGATION

It has been 12 years since the U.S. Supreme Court issued its famous ruling outlawing school desegregation, yet there is more school segregation than ever before in the north.

Since 1954, there has been a startling discovery that segregation is not confined to the Southern region. It is a national matter, a fact that is disturbing among those who have left their own messy backyards and pilgrimaged South to protest the evils of segregation.

After all the effort to create an integrated educational system, this fact remains:

Within the next 25 years, if present trends continue, public school enrollments in all big U.S. cities will be almost entirely non-white, and the enrollment in private schools will be at least 90 per cent white.

The Wall Street Journal, commenting on the situation, says the neighborhood school—which has sound arguments in its favor—in practice resulted in schools being all white or non-white, since few city neighborhoods are racially mixed.

"Negro leaders," the newspaper continued, "contend that sort of segregation is just as detrimental to Negro children as separate schools were in the South. The average white child is more ambitious, more education-minded than the average Negro child; thus, Negro leaders say, the Negro child in a school with a few white youngsters lacks examples to emulate. Moreover, the teachers sometimes tend to shy away from schools where Negro predominate."

All the "expert" advice that has been offered on how the South can best achieve school integration apparently doesn't work in the North.

Chicago Woman Wages Fight Against Damming the Grand Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, I believe, Donna-Wynne Rhys, of Chicago, wants to see all 280 miles of the Grand Canyon preserved unspoiled and unmarred by two huge power dams.

But few, if any, have been as vigorous as Miss Rhys in her independent action to back up her convictions.

Miss Rhys has written letters of protest to the newspapers in her areas, has had printed bumper stickers against the damming of the Grand Canyon, and has collected 616 signatures on petitions protesting the proposed dambuilding and urging the passage of legislation to expand the Grand Canyon National Park to include the entire canyon. Among the signers of the petition are three Illinois mayors, Edward E. Bluthardt, of Schiller Park; Benjamin J. Brzezinski, of Franklin Park; and Joseph Sieb, of Norridge.

Because of the strong feelings illustrated by these actions I include hereafter the petition circulated by Miss Rhys. As a result of her efforts a number of concerned individuals have also written to her to express their opposition to the dams. I include also two typical letters:

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

"SAVE THE GRAND CANYON

"Must the Grand Canyon of Arizona, that awesome and wondrously beautiful work of nature, be sacrificed to industry?

"The U.S. Department of the Interior says it should. A House subcommittee has before it a bill sponsored by that department that would authorize the building of two dams across the Colorado River within the Grand Canyon. One of the dams, to be built at the lower end of the canyon, would flood the entire length of the Grand Canyon National Monument and back up 13 miles into the Grand Canyon National Park.

"Those in favor of the dams say they are needed to irrigate Arizona. No one would deny that Arizona needs water. But that is not the real purpose of the dams.

"The purpose of the dams is to create a source of electrical power. The water the dams pen up in reservoirs will not be used for irrigation. It will be used as a source of power, one-fourth of which will be used to pump water to Arizona's Phoenix-Tucson areas from already existing Lake Havasu, behind the Parker Dam, far down the Colorado River. The remainder of the electrical power created by the dams will be sold. Opponents to the project have pointed out that there are sufficient alternatives to the proposed dams as a source of electrical power in the Southwest and that Department of Interior spokesment have referred to the two dams as potential 'cash registers.'

"The Grand Canyon is one of the great scenic wonders of the world. On its walls are written millions of years of the geologic history of Earth. To contemplate trading that treasure for a 'cash register' is shameful.

"Rep. HENRY S. REUSS (D-Wis.) has introduced a bill to increase the size of Grand Canyon National Park and prevent the construction of the dams. Illinois members of the House should give REUSS full support. The Grand Canyon doesn't have to be destroyed but it will be if firm action is not taken."

We, the undersigned, join in a Petition protesting the construction of dams across the Colorado River within the Grand Canyon in accordance with the editorial contained in the Chicago Sun Times on Tuesday, May 10, 1966, a copy of which prefaces this Petition, and urge passage of bill No. H.R. 14211 introduced on March 31, 1966, by Rep. HENRY S. REUSS of Wisconsin to enlarge the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona.

JUNE 20, 1966.

DEAR MRS. RHYS: I neglected to write this letter when I first saw your contribution in "Opinion of the People," intending to do it "some time". But yesterday I saw (for the second time) Joseph Wood Krutch's magnificent film about the Grand Canyon on television, and once again cringed at the sight of the results of man "tinkering" with nature.

So please forward our double protest to the men in Washington who will support HR 14211. We must put a stop to the despoilage of beautiful, natural landscapes to benefit a few people with money.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. M. E. ROSS.

PARK RIDGE, ILL.

WINNETKA, ILL.,
May 30, 1966.

DEAR MRS. RHYS: Please add my name, that of my husband and of our friends, Mr. and Mrs. Weldon Reynolds of Evanston to suport HR 14211, and in opposition to any dam affecting the Grand Canyon.

We have written our representative to this effect, but want to add our voices to other pressures you can apply.

Sincerely,

MIRIAM F. STEEL.

Andy Borg, National Commander of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Urges Vietnam Step-up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night, Mr. Andy Borg, national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars speaking in Asheville, N.C., urged a big and fast stepup in the U.S. war effort in Vietnam.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a newspaper article on Mr. Borg's remarks and add that I am wholeheartedly in support of his remarks:

VFW COMMANDER URGES STEP-UP IN WAR EFFORT

A big and fast step-up in the U.S. war effort in Viet Nam was urged here Saturday night by Andy Borg of Superior, Wis., the commander-in-chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Borg delivered a major VFW policy speech at a banquet session of the mid-summer meeting of the Southern Conference of VFW in the Battery Park Hotel.

The VFW chief said he had sent a telegram to President Lyndon B. Johnson "on behalf of the 1,300,000 overseas veterans of foreign wars" conveying the "complete support of foreign war veterans for your courageous and necessary decision to bomb enemy targets in the Hanoi-Haiphong area.

"This decision by you," Borg said in his telegram, "will reduce communist capability for aggression and will thus help reduce United States casualties and those of our allies."

Commenting on the Viet Nam demonstrations, Borg said that the demonstrations by certain elements in South Viet Nam are an unfortunate, but understandable occurrence.

"There is no doubt that the turmoil, although limited as it apparently is to the three major cities, has temporarily slowed the momentum of the war effort," he said.

"However," he continued, "the demonstrations have not altered the basic situation. The fact still remains that the communists, directed, supplied and supported by Red China, and the Soviet Union, are waging a war of aggression against South Viet Nam."

The VFW chief also pointed out that communism is determined to seize that country and defeat the United States in the process, and we must be just as determined the stop the spread of communism.

"Of course," Borg said, "the demonstrators cannot all be labeled as communists. In a country which has been at war for 12 years, there are some who are tired and discouraged. But we would be naive, indeed to assume that the communists are not actively helping and exploiting the unrest."

Borg explained that the war has not been going well for the communists since the sizeable commitment of U.S. combat troops. "We must recognize that it is standard communist strategy for them to try to win in the streets what they cannot win on the battlefield," he said.

The VFW commander urged a four-point program in stepping up the U.S. war effort in Viet Nam:

Cut-off free world and communist-bloc shipping into North Viet Nam by blockade, and, if necessary, mining the Haiphong harbor.

Bomb fuel supplies, and other military targets in the Hanoi area.

Destroy railroad communications between Red China and North Viet Nam.

Build-up U.S. troop strength in South Viet Nam.

Borg explained that his recommendations with respect to South Viet Nam are based on his personal observations in that country a few months ago. While there, he was with U.S. and South Viet Nam troops in every major combat area.

The VFW commander also said, "The VFW fully supports the stronger action being taken by the Johnson Administration in South Viet Nam. The VFW believes that the United States has no choice but to win this war. To do so, requires patience, perseverance and power. We must prove to the communists and the free world that we have, as a nation, these indispensable ingredients for victory."

A grand ball was held after the banquet in the Gold Room. The Ladies Auxiliary will hold a breakfast Sunday morning honoring national officers. Joint, individual meets Sunday will close the summer session.

Death of the Honorable James B. Hare

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am grieved to hear of the death of the Honorable James B. Hare, one of our distinguished former colleagues and a dear friend. It was my privilege to serve with James Hare when he represented the Third District of South Carolina in the 81st Congress and to enjoy a warm friendship with him. Congressman Hare served his district with distinction and ability. He comes from a family of dedicated and loyal Americans who have given long and able service to our Nation. His father is the Honorable Butler B. Hare, with whom I also had the privilege and great pleasure of serving in Congress and who is still living.

Many of my colleagues here today will also remember with affection Congressman Hare's brother, Adm. Robert Hayne Hare, who served here with great ability representing the U.S. Navy in Congress and who is now in the Pentagon.

I consider it a privilege to add my praise to his memory, and I extend my condolences, as a longtime friend, to the members of his family.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate worked on foreign aid bill and cleared NASA authorizations for White House.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 15935–16014

Bills Introduced: Six bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3639–3644; S.J. Res. 179–180; and S. Con. Res. 103. **Page 15936**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 15225, increasing limitation on authority of the TVA to issue bonds to finance its power program (S. Rept. 1399);

H.R. 14548, extending the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, with amendment (S. Rept. 1400);

H.R. 8188, allowing Federal income tax deduction for contributions to nonprofit organizations operated to consider questions of judicial reform, with amendments and with individual views (S. Rept. 1401);

H.R. 12389, to increase authorizations for development of the Arkansas Post National Memorial (S. Rept. 1402);

S. 2097, providing for judicial review of the constitutionality of grants or loans under certain acts, with individual views (S. Rept. 1403);

S. 1237, proposed Design Protection Act, with amendments (S. Rept. 1404);

S. 3238, private bill (S. Rept. 1405);

S. 3254, relating to the scope of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and to repeal inconsistent legislation (S. Rept. 1406);

H.R. 13277, providing for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, with amendments (S. Rept. 1407); and

S. 3070, to repeal provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act with respect to limitations on the leasing of coal lands imposed upon railroads (S. Rept. 1408). **Pages 15935–15936**

Relocation Payments: Senate passed with committee amendments S. 1681, to provide for uniform relocation payments to persons or businesses displaced by federally assisted programs. **Pages 15947–15965**

NASA Authorizations: H.R. 14324, fiscal 1967 authorizations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, was cleared for President when Senate adopted conference report thereon. **Pages 15981–15984**

Foreign Aid: Senate continued consideration of S. 3584, proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, taking the following additional actions on amendments:

Adopted: By 51 yeas to 31 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Ellender-Morse amendment to reduce from $700 to $658 million authorized funds for supporting assistance in fiscal year 1967; and Miller amendment to allow aid to any nation in arrears on U.N. assessments only if President determines that such aid is in the U.S. interest and he transmits report to Congress setting forth the assurance of the nation in arrears that it is putting such payments on a current basis or its statement of exceptional circumstances making it incapable of so doing.

Senate debated a McCarthy amendment to retain minimum interest rate for second stage of loans under Development Loan Fund at 2½ percent rather than raising it to 3 percent, but the amendment was modified and then withdrawn to be reoffered July 25 as amendment No. 697.

The yeas and nays were ordered on the pending Cooper amendment (No. 175) that would increase to 2 years from 1 year the authorization for development loan program to Alliance for Progress nations. By unanimous consent, it was agreed that after voting on the pending Cooper amendment, Senate will consider Bayh amendment No. 652 barring certain iron and steel products containing components originating elsewhere than U.S. or a limited free world country, and will then consider McCarthy amendment No. 697 respecting interest rates on certain Development Loan Fund loans. **Pages 16015–16048**

Confirmations: Senate confirmed nominations of Samuel M. Nabrit, of Texas, and Wilfrid E. Johnson, of Washington, to be members of AEC; and 18 judicial nominations. **Page 16049**

Record Vote: One record vote was taken today. **Page 16023**

Appendix

The Factor of Morale in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TENO RONCALIO
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the report made Tuesday, July 12, with my colleagues on our recent trip to Vietnam, I am pleased to add to my report of that date the following items dealing with the morale of our troops—and the morale of the other side.

As Tolstoy pointed out in "War and Peace," morale is the *x* factor in a fighting force which can compensate for many other deficiencies and which is so often decisive.

I have never known the morale of fighting men, based upon my experience in the two wars since my youth, to be any higher than I found in Vietnam. On the one particular day I spent with the troops of the 18th Infantry Division, I was pleased to notice that nearly all rifle company combat infantrymen seemed to have had a calm approach and professional, businesslike demeanor in their combat duties.

I was particularly struck with the fact that a large percentage of the troops were colored and I made a point of visiting for a few minutes with several squads at a time to discuss the tremendous opportunities open to these men, all of them, following their service in Vietnam. I believe every veteran there will wear his Vietnam service as a badge of honor for the rest of his life and I have no question but what those who probably will come to the front of leadership in America—in our rights movement and in the progress for all people—will come from the ranks of those now serving in Vietnam. It disturbs one very much to read, in the current issue of Life magazine, the constant repetition of the fact that the masses in the Watts area and other ghettoes of the colored sections of the large towns of America simply do not have leadership. We lack leaders, we have no leaders, is the saying.

BLACK POWER MILITANTS

It is my true belief that what a few rights activists in the States now ought to do is to get to Vietnam without further ado and to fulfill the proof of loyalty to the Nation and to its institutions with a tour of duty in the infantry ranks there and then return to speak of equal opportunity, once proof is available of the equal responsibility and the equal accomplishments of defending America and protecting it from foreign aggression.

With these particular troops it was my pleasure to be accompanied by my colleague, ROMAN PUCINSKI, and we made it a point to stress that the two of us stemmed from immigrant parents and the lowest economic levels possible in the United States of America and we stressed that in one short generation each of us was able to practice his profession, serve honorable duty for our country in a war, establish his education and profession—with the benefit of the GI bill—and proceed to a career as a Congressman. We impressed on each and every one of these soldiers that this role is open for them and that the sky is their limit, too—and that the greatest achievement they have made is to begin their careers as infantrymen in time of war. We believe this is the strongest and best thing we could do for the morale of these gentlemen.

ROTATION OF TROOPS

There is no question but what the 1-year rotation policy is one reason that morale is as good as it is.

Following my speech to request rotation in Vietnam, I was particularly grateful to staff officials at the White House, to the Secretary of Defense, and members of his staff, and particurlarly to Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for their help and assistance to me in the discussion of the complicated factors involved in rotation. Further, Mr. Speaker, had it not been for the great loyalty and help of the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, my distinguished and widely respected friend OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas, I doubt very much if the success now enjoyed in these policies could have been accomplished.

In March, Chairman TEAGUE gave me his assurance of cooperation and his efforts to establish a tour of duty and rotation from combat assignment is perhaps another of the many accomplishments of this remarkable man in his service to the people of America—from his vantage point of power as chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

I also feel I should pay great tribute to the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and to three members of his organization, who were kind and patient enough with me to sit down and go through the difficult work in distinguishing the factors of rotation as they would effect combat efficiency, personnel changes, morale, and numerous other items, which had a bearing upon this complicated subject matter. Without the personal help of the Vice President, I doubt very much if these changes could have been effected.

It has now been established by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Speaker, that, first: rotation and replacement will be accomplished on an individual basis; not on a unit basis; and second, the personnel rotation is a continuing process; and third, and sure the most important matter, that current and planned replacements as of this time contemplate an average monthly rotation for in excess of the 2 percent of unit personnel—or four riflemen per company, per month, that had been my suggestion in my speech on the floor of the House on February 24, 1966.

I wish to quote from a communication sent to me by General Berg, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, regarding the effect of this type of rotation policy. His letter of April 23, contains the following:

> I realize it might appear that under a prescribed 12 months tour of duty for Vietnam, unit composition will change only upon the anniversary dates of unit arrivals in Vietnam. In this regard, it is true that some members who initially arrived in Vietnam with their units will remain for a full 12 months' tour of duty. Hopefully, there will be many in this category for their Vietnam experience is most essential, not only for unit combat effectiveness, but also for orienting and giving guidance to new replacements as they are integrated into operating units. But the fact is that not all unit members had 12 months remaining to serve on active duty or on their units' arrival in Vietnam. Some had as little as four months remaining. Obviously, these personnel have to be replaced and sent home for discharge in accordance with their terms of service. In other cases, units ordered into Vietnam from other Pacific bases contained members who had already served portions of their overseas tour. These members also were rotated home early. Inevitably, too, there is personnel attrition resulting from battle casualties.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, the process of change in unit personnel composition tends to be a continuing one, wherein replacements are being effected on a weekly and monthly basis. Obviously, there will be peaks and valleys in the rotational flow. But, as a minimum, rotation should average about 8 percent of unit personnel per month. For a rifle company, this should amount to an average of about 14 to 16 men per month depending on the size of the company—180 officers and men for an Army rifle company; 203 for a Marine rifle company.

Thus, while the morale of American troops improves, that of the Communist forces seems to be declining. Recent Rand Corp., studies of captured Vietcong show that, in contrast to their attitude a few months ago, our opponents no longer seem to feel that they have a chance of success. Their desertion rate has been steadily increasing.

More insight into the trends of morale on both sides is provided by a perceptive editorial by Bernie Horton, in a recent edition of the Wyoming Eagle, published in Cheyenne. He points to major developments which confirm that the tide is now running in our favor and will continue to do so as long as those of us here at home provide the necessary moral support to our fighting men in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD, so that I may share these worthy ideas with my colleagues:

NOTES OF OPTIMISM

Slight as they may be, there have been notes of optimism in connection with the war in Viet Nam this week.

Tuesday, President Johnson said there were indications that the Communists no longer really expected to achieve a military victory in Viet Nam.

The President told a news conference at his LBJ ranch that these indications had come to him through diplomatic channels but he did not pinpoint any specific source.

It was the first time a top U.S. official had reported evidence that the Communists had come to a conclusion that they could not win on the battlefield.

The President's remark attracted particular attention because it came after a French magazine report that North Vietnamese leader Ho Chi Minh had advised Peking and Moscow that unless he received greatly increased help, he would have no choice but to undertake negotiations with the United States and South Viet Nam.

Meanwhile, Premier Nguyen Cao Ky installed a new 80-man military and civilian council to "help unify the nation," and he predicted a victory over communism within a year.

Ky said allied forces are within sight of final victory over the Viet Cong.

"According to intelligence reports, the Communists have strengthened their forces," Ky said. "But with the greater firepower of the United States, Allied and Vietnamese troops—with ability and flexibility—we may have victory by the end of the year."

Yesterday, Undersecretary of State George Ball said the leaders of North Viet Nam apparently had given up hope of a military victory in the war. At a Washington news conference, Ball said this was the tone of reports from other governments with contacts in Hanoi.

Ball also said there is no evidence that the Red Chinese are likely to intervene directly in the war. The undersecretary, who is running the state department while Secretary Rusk tours Asia, said he did not want to draw "an overly optimistic picture" of the Viet Nam situation. But he said the reports the department has been receiving bear out the war-wariness of the North Vietnamese people.

All of this points up the importance of our presenting a unified front to the world.

It has long been apparent the Communists had no intention of moving from the battlefield to the conference table so long as there was any hope they might win.

Only last week, Secretary Rusk said the Communists apparently were pinning their hopes on criticism of the Viet Nam war from within the United States.

"America has reason to think Hanoi has been banking heavily on criticism from within the United States and elsewhere in the free world as well as on political dissent within South Viet Nam," he said.

The time is now for the arch-critics of American policy in Viet Nam to put away their megaphones.

We must make it clear to the Communists that the United States is united in its effort and determination in Southeast Asia.

Once the Communists realize their final hope for success is gone—that they are not going to be allowed to take over South Viet Nam—perhaps they may be willing to end the fighting and move to the conference table.

Remarks of U.S. Representative John E. Fogarty at New England School Library Association Spring Conference, Newport, R.I., Saturday, May 21, 1966, at 1 p.m.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

REMARKS OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JOHN E. FOGARTY AT NEW ENGLAND SCHOOL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION SPRING CONFERENCE, NEWPORT, R.I., SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1966, AT 1 P.M.

I am happy to be here today to address the New England School Library Association on new legislation and its impact on school libraries.

In the past 3 years, it would seem that the Congress has been extremely busy increasing the demands to be placed on school librarians. The Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Higher Education Act of 1965, the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 are six pieces of major legislation that will either directly or indirectly affect school libraries. The poverty programs of the Economic Opportunity Act, as we all know, are creating a market expansion of library books and textbooks geared to the culturally and educationally deprived. School librarians are meeting demands for afterschool programs and paperback lending libraries for the underprivileged with every ounce of their energies. They are being called upon to survey existing resources and to absorb great quantities of new resources. And with their help these programs for tutoring, independent study, and general strengthening of community education are working.

Programs under the Library Services and Construction Act are calling upon cooperation between public librarians and school librarians in assessing the overall needs of the community for expanded library services. Interlibrary agreements will be formed to extend the flow of books in areas which must be upgraded educationally.

Vocational education programs will place greater listings of technical and vocational education reference books in school libraries. Programs of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities will bring greater quantities of instructional materials in these two categories to be placed in school libraries.

The Higher Education Act of 1965, which includes a title for community service and continuing education programs, will create an increased request for books on social problems to be made available in both school and public libraries. School librarians will be called upon to assist public and school administrators in pulling together informational materials for the study and solution of community problems.

These are just a few of the acts which will place indirect demands on school librarians as the administrators of school library programs. The act most responsible for direct involvement of school librarians in new programs is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Because of these new responsibilities, I would like to turn our attention to this act for the next few minutes.

Last year, when considering the proposals for strengthening elementary and secondary education in the United States, my colleagues and I were alarmed by the status of school libraries. We felt that quality in textbooks and school library programs was directly related to a student's academic achievement and future educational goals. Yet, almost 70 percent of the public and more than 50 percent of the private elementary schools had no libraries. Nearly one-half of our elementary school children were attending schools that did not have libraries. Public schools were spending from $2 to $4 less per pupil than was recommended to maintain even minimum school library standards.

As a result of reports relating to us the extreme needs of schools for assistance to build up their libraries, we drafted Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Later, when the bill was passed by the Congress, the U.S. Office of Education and the State Library Agencies joined together to administer the program for strengthening school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials.

The State plans that have emerged from State Library Agencies show great promise for the future of school libraries. State plans had to illustrate specific needs by category within the three main headings of library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials.

In order to pinpoint such needs, many States had to take inventories of library books within each major classification of the Dewey decimal system for the first time. This meant that school library problems would no longer be clouded by simply vague statistics on the need for a number of estimated volumes. Each State Library Agency would have a quick catalog of all school library resources and could draw up specific title listings of standard volumes to be purchased. Each State Library Agency would also know whether grant funds should be concentrated on library books or on items such as filmstrips, globes, encyclopedia sets and classroom reading books.

Title II State plans reflect the reports of these surveys. Acquistion of library resources has been given priority by the States. Every State plan calls for spending at least half its money from school library resources. Twenty of the 34 State plans require at least two-thirds of their allotments to be used for this category.

The progress in the New England area under the Title II program has been extremely encouraging. In our State of Rhode Island, a special Title II coordinator has been appointed to the Office of the Commissioner of Education to assure effective administration of the program. The State plan for Vermont calls for 100 percent of Title II funds to be used for school library resources. It calls for the Director of the Division of School Libraries to administer Title II. His position is financed by by another section of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1956. The State plan for Maine similarly emphasizes library resources by calling for 100 percent of the allotment to be spent on this item. One good feature of the Maine plan is the stipulation requiring that each project application contain an assurance that all teachers were given an opportunity to submit lists of materials needed by them and their pupils. This kind of stipulation brings the teacher and the librarian into even closer coordination as they work to achieve the best possible educational atmosphere for their students.

Connecticut's Title II plan, in addition to concentrating on school library resources, establishes an index of need to determine grants to local school districts. The four criteria for grants include: the quantity of *materials presently available in relation to existing State standards; quality of available materials; average expenditure of the school district in the past; ability to pay factor.*

In this manner the Connecticut State plan hits the areas with the greatest need first.

In the State of New Hampshire, administrators of the Title II program will call for regular inventories of available resources in each individual school participating in the program. These inventories should help them continue to raise school library resources to recommend standards over the next few years.

Finally, the Massachusetts State Plan provides for coordination of Titles I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to establish demonstration school libraries. These libraries will serve as inservice program locations in several regions of the State.

My talking about the Massachusetts State Plan coordination of Titles I, II, and II brings me to another important and encouraging aspect of the impact of Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs on school libraries. When the Congress passed this act, we could only guess about the emphasis to be placed on library resources in elementary and secondary education programs. We hoped Title II would immediately aid school districts in alleviating the substandard conditions of many school libraries. Since that time, we have seen local and State educational administrators develop and mount projects totaling roughly $1 billion worth of school aid. Now, we have a clearer picture of what the schools are doing. Library resources are being emphasized in Title II projects. Just as important is the fact that Title I projects for the disadvantaged are emphasizing library books as a primary learning tool for school children. Out of 5,000 approved projects, 2,090 had library components. Recurringly, projects have expressed the need for the provision of books and periodicals to create a desire to read on the part of educationally deprived children. Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has predictably received applications emphasizing better library resources for school children. Community school libraries are being established. In New England, the creativity of local school districts has led to even more exciting developments for school libraries. The Pittsford, Vermont, Title III project provides a Mobile Library Service Center to transport library and instructional materials among nine elementary and one secondary rural schools. In North Providence, Rhode Island, A Center for Reading Diagnosis and Remediation will provide resources for all remedial reading programs.

As you can see, States are really working to develop educational resources under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The groundwork for better instruction, for more individualized study, and for excellent school libraries has been done. It is left to each librarian and each teacher to make the plans really work. At the Congressional level, we can only pass the legislation. The hard work of local and State administrators coupled with school librarians and teachers must be counted upon to make programs effective. I think, judging from the reports and plans coming from the New England States, we can depend upon you to see that the new legislation programs have the impact of education hoped for by the Congress that passed them.

But mounting the programs currently providing new services and more books to school children, their parents, and members of communities in the United States is not the only demand that faces school librarians in the next few years. At the same time that Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs are raising school library standards by bringing volume numbers up to par, educational technological know-how is growing at such a pace that within a decade school librarians will be receiving requests for reference materials now beyond the scope of our limited experience and imagination. The computer centers for information storage and retrieval units now being established under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will be vitally linked to school libraries. The Systems Approach to Learning—which will involve basic instructional kits, audio-visual support for research, and textbooks including information punch cards for computers—will demand cooperation between teacher and school librarian in leading children to the full exploration required in individual research and programmed instruction suited to each student's particular need.

These new developments are going to call for tremendous growth and flexibility on the part of school librarians. The very general wording of our legislation only sets forth the principles for programs to cope with educational and technological advances in elementary and secondary education. School librarians will have to supply the specific operational support to make such advanced programs effective.

Again, I want to commend you for your fine work thus far under current programs and the demands which they have placed upon you. I can only envy you the challenge that future educational programs have in store.

A Veteran Reporter Answers a Columnist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to the following article by Mrs. Sarah McClendon, which appeared in the July 17 issue of the El Paso Times. The article is in response to the article recently written by a well-known columnist about our colleague, the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers.

As you all know, Mrs. McClendon is a veteran Washington newspaper woman, who has always had a great facility for ferreting out the facts. This article is a fine example of her excellent reporting—written in her own inimitable style:

Rivers, Denying Charges, Asks "Why Did Pearson Attack Me?"

(By Sarah McClendon)

Washington.—Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, Democrat, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Armed Services committe, who was accused by Columnist Drew Pearson of being drunk and delaying vitally important military bills in the House, stood his ground and declared Pearson's accusation wholly false.

Rivers gave no question but that if the two should ever meet face to face, the feud would break out again.

The South Carolinian, noted for his hard work, long hours and plainspoken criticism of the way Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara is running the defense establishment, said it might be well for the American people "to examine deeply to see what are the causes of Pearson's personal attack on himself and Sen. Thomas Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut.

"Sen. Dodd fought communism. Pearson atacked him viciously, personally. I attacked the Pentagon, McNamara and the way this administration has been weakening the military forces of this nation and trying to take away the powers of Congress. What Pearson is trying to do, I don't know but maybe I will find out eventually. I have a long memory. And when a man attacks me, I don't forget. I am not going to sue Pearson now, Maybe I will wait and see how Sen. Dodd comes out in his suit against him."

SAYS STATEMENTS FALSE

Rivers was described by Pearson in a columne on June 14 as a drunkard whose bouts with drunkeness had caused five cancellations in the committee meetings on the military construction bill and in floor consideration by the House of the nearly $18 billion military procurement bill for weapons.

"This just is not true and records of my committee on each commitee meeting will prove that I am right and Pearosn wrong," said Rivers.

The column appeared, Rivers noted, on the day he was scheduled to present the bill to the House.

After the article appeared, Speaker of the House John McCormack, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and House Majority Leader Carl Albert, Democrat, of Oklahoma, both somewhat straitlaced, joined in tributes to Rivers as did a number of other House members. Their remarks gave the impression of showing defiance, independence and disbelief of the Pearson article.

"I deny these charges absolutely, personally and officially. I have been really ill. There have been no delays in committee consideration of the procurement bill or in the military construction bill which my committee is presently considering.

ADMITS SOME DRINKING

"I have been suffering excruciating pain from a calcium formation in my neck, a condition which doctors say looks like a fog bank on x-rays. I have been under doctors' care for this and have taken treatments here at the capitol and at Bethesda Naval hospital. I will not go there again for fear I would get more publicity. I will say if you take the pills they give you out there, they will put you out of your mind.

"I have in my time indulged in some drinking. But it makes me sick when I drink so in recent years I have stopped it. If I want to take a drink, that is my business. I have liquor in my office right now for visitors. Who around here does not? But I want to tell you something—I don't drink nearly as much as many other people I observe around here. So, why was Pearson hammering at me? He must have a reason.

"I was drinking ginger ale down at the White House the other night when the congressional leaders were summoned there. I notice another congressman whom Pearson treats so kindly was taking one drink after another. Liquor was being served freely.

"I don't think my drinking is what Pearson is really getting after. I don't know what he is after. But I think this attack is aimed at the things I stand for and what I have been trying to do with this committee."

SEES ATTACK ON CONGRESS

"I also think Pearson is attacking the Congress, for its daring to differ with the Pentagon and for its stand in support of me and my committee in upping our defense program above and beyond what McNamara wants.

"I am quite sure that this is an attack on the belief that Congress has the constitutional right to 'raise and support armies' to defend this country sufficiently."

Rivers said he is confident that Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara had nothing to do with the Pearson article, despite the fact it referred to the ennity between the two.

Rivers said he had reason to believe that Pearson told McNamara about the forthcoming column and McNamara begged him not to print it. McNamara told Pearson, so RIVERS was informed, "Please don't write that—he will think I put that out, and I want to get along with him."

Here are some of the major differences RIVERS has had with McNamara:

The McNamara plan to reorganize the reserves and National Guard, to cut out large numbers of the reserves and to shift command of the various guard units;

The amounts of money to be spent on research for the nation's future bomber, with RIVERS favoring $11.2 millions and McNamara backing only about $8 millions;

The scrapping by McNamara of the manned bombers used in the Strategic Air Command, the B–58's and others;

RIVERS' favoring further research and development now on Nike X;

The nuclear Navy;

RIVERS' insistence on the Congress giving the Defense Department $620 millions more than McNamara wanted and the latter's serving notice that he would not spend it;

A general feeling by RIVERS that McNamara's dogged determination and policies were weakening, not strengthening the armed forces.

NECK, SHOULDERS RUBBED

RIVERS' aides say that he had been going to the gymnasium in the Rayburn Office Building repeatedly of late to have his neck and shoulders rubbed. He left the committee on one occasion to do this, possibly others, turning the gavel over to another high-ranking member. He smelled strongly during this time of a well known medicine, wintergreen, used to rub joints, his associates said. He showed friends how calcium deposits caused his neck to pop if he held it to one side. He also had heat treatments in the office of the House physician at the capitol.

RIVERS produced the files of his committee to show that it held frequent and scheduled meetings.

These files upon examination show that he presided on May 3 when the final consideration of the military procurement bill took place. He then announced that hearings on the military construction bill would begin on Tuesday, May 10. From then on, records of the committee showed that there were many hearings of the committee. Hearings on the construction bill were held on May 11, May 12, a Thursday, when the group adjourned to go over until Monday, May 16, as is customary with House committees. They met on May 17 and 18.

On May 18, RIVERS called the meeting to order, and immediately turned the chair over to Rep. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, D-Mass., "as he, Mr. RIVERS, had to appear before the Rules Committee in behalf of a rule on S. 2950," the military procurement bill. PHILBIN, at the close of business on this date, announced hearings on the construction bill would be resumed the following Monday, May 23.

Hearings were held on May 23, 24, 25. On that last date, the chairman announced that the hearings would be resumed on Tuesday, May 31.

MANAGED VITAL BILL

RIVERS presided as the meeting opened on May 31. Soon after the committee met, it was necessary for the chairman to leave for another appointment and he turned the chair over to Rep. F. EDWARD HÉBERT, D.-La. What the appointment was, was not mentioned in the records. HÉBERT presided all that day and again on June 1, when he announced that the hearings were adjourned subject to the call of the chair.

On June 14, RIVERS presented the Military Procurement bill to the House. He spoke and "managed" the bill to passage, with an additional $900 millions which McNamara did not want but which RIVERS thought ought to be allowed for nuclear Navy, Nike X and other programs.

The committee next met on June 15. It met on June 16 to resume hearings on the military construction bill which are still on.

Certainly it would appear that Pearson was wrong when he wrote that on five successive times when the House committee was called to meet during the past weeks to approve massive new military construction bill that it could not function because of RIVERS' drinking. It would also seem that from May 18 when the House Rules Committee acted on the Military Procurement Bill until June 14 was not too long a time to wait for scheduling by the leadership of this bill especially in view of the fact a national holiday over a long week-end had occurred during the interval.

ADDITIONAL FACTS

These additional facts were uncovered:

RIVERS had avoided liquor for five years. During that time, some persons who knew and saw him frequently said he stayed away from it altogether. Others were not so sure that he did not now and then take a little on occasions.

One man said "I have seen him in his office for 20 years and I have never seen him drunk, nor have I ever seen bottles lying around as Pearson said. I have been in his office at the close of a hard day and had a drink or two when he did not take any. I have been with him in South Carolina when others about him had drinks and he did not."

Pearson referred to RIVERS being unclothed partially in his office. An associate said he would have to admit that he had seen RIVERS in his office at 7 a.m. when he was not wearing a tie. But RIVERS frequently gets up at his home in McLean, Va., and drives to his office at 4 or 5 a.m. After he gets there, he somtimes shaves. That could have accounted for the fact that he was not wearing a tie when a friend with whom he frequently talks early in the morning walked in.

If RIVERS is an alcoholic, then his appetite does not indicate it.

The chef in the House restaurant cafeteria where RIVERS usually eats says he gets there around 4 or 5 a.m. and often RIVERS has beaten him. RIVERS keeps a huge southern ham in the restaurant and the chef cuts him a swathe of it. He regularly eats with this two eggs and a quantity of grits, butter and biscuits.

Friends say he seldom complains about his aches and this is one reason why his neck pains were not known about generally.

Basically he is one of those full-of-energy guys who is wound up all day. Then when he unwinds, he is exhausted.

Rep. O. C. FISHER, D-Tex., member of RIVERS' committee, did not participate in the speech making in praise of RIVERS' conduct on the committee that follower the Pearson article. Did he believe the Pearson article? FISHER was asked.

"It was about 10 per cent truth and about 90 per cent untruth," said FISHER. "I have known MENDEL fairly closely and in three years I personally have never seen him take a drop of liquor. And I think I would have known if he had."

CERTAINLY NOT DRUNK

During the period when Pearson indicated RIVERS had been in a drunken condition, unable to preside over his committee another old friend of the Congressman, Rep. W. R. POAGE, D-Tex., said he saw RIVERS at the airport with his wife" and he certainly was not drunk nor did he give a evidence of having been drunk."

A woman reporter for southern newspapers said she covered his office for five years and not once had she seen him when he had been drinking.

A man who has known RIVERS since his youth and who has occasion to supervise his habits said he assumed the chairmanship of the Armed Services Committee with reverence and dignity and full recognition of the importance of the office. He was determined, said this old acquaintance, to remain scrupulous in his conduct at all times as he realized fully that there were certain interests out to prey on him seeking to use him if they could. He was determined not to deviate.

INFLUENCING TRIED

It was learned that some friends had tried to influence him in actions which would have operated to serve their special interests and they had found Rivers to be unbending, according to his old friend. They had reasons for wanting RIVERS to conform to their thinking. There is some indication that finally these persons wooed RIVERS by making liquor available in one of his unsuspecting moments in South Carolina.

Why did certain persons want to collaborate with Pearson to try to ruin RIVERS?

He is a man of leadership and never has run from a fight. Now, faced with Pearson's devastating column and feeling somewhat humiliated, RIVERS is nevertheless not cowed by it. But he is more determined than ever to carry on with his committee chairmanship and his programs for what he believes to be in the best interests of the nation.

The Police and Law and Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Nation was properly concerned with the racial unrest which erupted in Chicago this month, and as always in such instances, there is much comment over the background, the immediate cause, and finally possible cures for the problem. I submit for the RECORD two editorials, one broadcast over WBBM–TV, Chicago on July 19, and the other over WIND, Chicago on July 15 which I believe gives a very clear picture, each in its own effective fashion, of the thinking of concerned citizens not only in the Chicago metropolitan area, but for that matter, across the country.

The editorials follow:

STANDPOINT—POLICE AT WORK

(Broadcast by Carter Davidson, WBBM–TV, Chicago, July 19, 1966, 6:25 to 6:30 p.m.)

Seldom, perhaps never, has a police force of a major city been put to the test like Chicago's was this past week. And, it may be added, seldom, perhaps never, has a police force acquitted itself so well.

The senseless, ghastly massacre of eight nurses last Thursday stunned virtually the whole community, indeed the whole country. But the police went quietly and expertly to work, and within hours were on the heels of a prime suspect. Seventy-two hours after the mass murder, he was in chains. Admittedly, he brought about his own arrest by trying to kill himself, but his capture was a dead certainty.

It was not movie-style detective work, but slow, arduous and painstaking police work, by foot and in the crime laboratory, that assured the capture of the suspect.

And, it all took place while the police force was already strained by the taxing effort of combatting one of the city's worst outbreaks of street rioting, the eruption of shooting, burning and looting on the West Side of Chicago.

Six policemen, including a police captain, were laid low with gunshot wounds in one night in that fracas, and scores of others were bruised and cut by flying bottles and rocks.

To so ably solve a fiendish mass murder, already dubbed "the crime of the century," while so beleaguered by street violence, reflects infinite credit upon the police department. It has a right to be proud of itself. More, it has earned the thanks and respect of the entire community.

It has become the fashion lately, thanks to the self-serving efforts of publicity-minded civil rights agitators, to bandy about such phrases as "police brutality."

This and other gimmicks, has caused a disrespect for the police that has led directly to the stoning, and even burning of police cars, and personal, insulting attacks upon policemen themselves.

It also has led to demands for a policing of the police, through a civilian review board. At the same time, high court rulings on the rights of criminals have tended to shackle policemen with their own handcuffs, as far as traditional police procedures are concerned. Add to this the fact that policemen are notoriously underpaid for the work they do and the risks they take, and the odds seem pretty highly stacked against the police force.

Chicago's police force, from Superintendent Orlando W. Wilson to the newest rookie, proved this past week that it doesn't count the odds. It does its job.

(Broadcast on WIND radio, Chicago, Friday, July 15, 16, 1966, by Ralph L. Atlass, vice president)

LAW AND ORDER

These remarks have to do with law and order, the basic concept upon which our life in America was based and can continue. The cornerstone of our civilization is an orderly procedure and the enforcement of that order by authorized men in uniform.

No personal liberties or private property can exist if the right to that property is not protected by our police.

It is ridiculous and frightening to contemplate the purported arrangement for the withdrawal of police from a riot-torn neighborhood while unauthorized and private citizens tried to negotiate a peace. The very moment that occurred was an open invitation for anarchy to take over.

Perhaps there is some excuse for this alleged indecision, because the police did not have sufficient forces available to them at the time. Nevertheless, such an act is an out-and-out breakdown of the very fiber of our law and order.

The man in the police uniform must be respected and he must be able to enforce the laws which he has sworn to uphold if we are to have an organized and orderly society.

The exercise of that authority means that the police must make arrests of individuals and mobs who defy the law. But law and order does not stop there. After the arrests have been made, the courts must enforce the law. The courts cannot be permissive with lawbreakers. Cicero once said, "The safety of the people shall be the highest law." That safety can only be secured by an orderly procedure. The law spells out the regulations; The police enforce those regulations; the courts must punish for infractions of those regulations.

It is good for Chicago that the National Guard has been called out to join with the police in the enforcement of law and order. The Guard should be kept in the troubled areas of our city until law and order have been restored.

Street gangs, mobs and individual lawbreakers must be deterred. They should be arrested when they violate the law. And the courts should realize that they have the sworn responsibility to properly pass sentence on those violators.

The courts must take that responsibility and cease giving rioters passes just because they are in great numbers. Instead, the courts should think about the risks incurred by the police and the National Guard in dealing with those who flout the law. The courts should reflect on the danger to lives and the damage to property. The courts should remember that the men who wear the uniform of the Chicago Police and the uniform of the National Guard are also citizens of the United States . . . and that they have sworn an oath to uphold law and order and to keep peace.

Law is a form of order, and good law must necessarily mean good order. If good order can only be maintained by curfew, then a curfew should be established with the proper authorities arresting everyone who is on the streets contrary to the established regulations.

The authority of the government of Chicago must be maintained at all costs. Without that firm authority there can be no government. Without that authority there can only be anarchy.

The Wilderness Is a Wilderness: Or To Save the Grand Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to build dams on the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon and Marble Gorge are being vigorously contested, as my colleagues are well aware.

Basic to this controversy is the fact that the American people have a deep interest in saving our last remaining wild lands from impairment of the sort entailed by these dams. The Wilderness Act of 1964 was an expression of this interest.

Many people who have never seen any part of the Grand Canyon have written to me, and to other Members of Congress, to say that they care about the Grand Canyon. It is no exaggeration to say that if we authorize dams in the Grand Canyon, citizens everywhere in the United States will be hurt by our action.

Mr. Arthur Hoppe directed his satire to this issue in a recent column in the San Francisco Chronicle. An excerpt from this column follows:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, June 15, 1966]

THE WILDERNESS IS A WILDERNESS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

The news that the Sierra Club may lose its tax exempt status for trying to save the Grand Canyon has led to the formation of a new conservation group—The Consensus Conservation Club.

"Our first goal is to establish our tax exempt status," explained Director Homer T. Pettibone, "through a militant campaign to fill up the Grand Canyon."

With what?

"Water," said Mr. Pettibone. "The dams presently proposed will fill only portions of the canyon a mere 300 feet deep, still leaving tourists a gruelling trek down to the water's edge. We contemplate a single, huge dam which will fill the Grand Canyon to the brim—thus creating an easily accessible lake offering boating, deep sea fishing and unlimited room for underwater sports.

"Needless to say, the Bureau of Reclamation, which dearly loves to build dams, is out of its mind with joy at the prospect. And once we have our tax exempt status, we expect limitless financial support from all true conservationists. Like the private power companies."

But filling up the Grand Canyon will be just a first step?

"Oh, yes," said Mr. Pettibone, adjusting his Homburg. "It's what we lovers of the Great Outdoors call "Creative Wilderness Development.'

"Now the basic problem with the wilderness areas of America today is that they are, let's face it, a wilderness. They've gone unchanged for millions of years. You certainly can't call that progress.

"Fortunately, however, there is a consensus that the wilderness must be conserved. Cattlemen, for example, favor conserving it for grazing; mining men for mining; oil men for oil drilling; advertising men for billboards; and so forth. We of the Consensus Conservation Club naturally favor conserving it for all these things."

But what about those who love the wilderness for itself?

"That's us!" cried Mr. Pettibone, placing his hand over the narrow left lapel of his mohair suit. "We all love the wilderness deeply. But who can enjoy it? Only a few hardy hikers and horsemen. Is this fair? No. We are thus fighting for freeways through the wilderness with hotels, restaurants and hot dog stands to refresh the weary wilderness lovers—not to mention housing tracts for those who wish to live in the wilderness."

But what will happen to the wilderness? "Oh, it will always be there just like the Grand Canyon," said Mr. Pettibone. "Down underneath."

Grand Canyon Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this week the House Interior Committee expects to conclude hearings on the controversial Colorado River project, and indications are that the bill will be reported favorably to the House. This is, therefore, a good time to reexamine the provisions of the legislation and the effect it will have on the economy and welfare of all Americans and particularly those in the Southwestern United States.

The Arizona Republic of June 25, 1966, contained a letter to the editor which I found particularly interesting, because the writer, a native Arizonan, is nevertheless opposed to the Colorado River project, especially the provisions for the central Arizona project. In her letter she focuses on the important economic aspects of the Grand Canyon issue, which are often overlooked in the furor over "saving" or "ruining" the canyon. I think the letter makes several sound points, and I commend it to the attention of all of my colleagues in the House.

The letter follows:

The People Speak: Canyon Debate Rages On—Readers Oppose Editorial

Editor, The Arizona Republic:

In commenting on your editorial "Canyon AND Project" (June 19), I would like to say that I am not a member of any conservationist organization, but I have hiked down the Grand Canyon to the Colorado and am of the opinion that dams, access roads, marinas, etc., would compromise the awesome serenity of the canyon and further alter the flow of the river.

Your editorial, as usual, equates the benefits that the Central Arizona Project would provide to a numerical minority with the interests of "Arizona" in general. I believe this is unfounded, and have derived my observations from numerous magazine articles, the record of the hearings of the Lower Colorado River Basin Project before the House Interior Reclamation Subcommittee, August 1965, and a well-documented analysis by Dean E. Mann entitled "The Politics of Water in Arizona," University of Arizona Press, 1963.

In your editorial you state, "CAP is of utmost importance in maintaining the economic underpinnings of Arizona." Even if economics must be the measure of all values, CAP, as now conceived, does not reflect a proportionate balance of these values. Dr. Mann says, "It is clear that not all of the demands presently being made on the water supply can long be satisfied. Some water uses will have to decline for others."

What are the demands? Arizona's population is somewhat over 1,300,000. Of that, 8,000 are farmers, or, 0.6 percent of the population. This 0.6 uses 95 per cent of the water. The remaining 5 per cent is used for domestic, industrial, municipal and recreational purposes combined. Moreover, the farmers are responsible for the shortage, having over a period of many years overpumped the groundwater supply, currently at the rate of 2.25 million acre feet annually.

Dr. Mann shows how the economic interests not only of the farmers, but of the cattlemen, lumbermen, mining, railroads and utilities have determined the use of water. Historically, the legislature has been putty in the hands of these pressure groups. For this reason, no state action has been taken "to provide for orderly planning for management of the water supply to pursue this task." This planning and machinery are essential in view of the "scarcity of water and the changing economic situation in the state." (You do not quote the Sierra Club when you say that it "pictures Arizonans as mean, soulless, mercenary individuals," but I am sure the Club refers to the situation described above rather than to individual Arizonans.)

How does CAP fail to take into account the changing economic situation? A Bureau of Reclamation chart shows the following contributions to Arizona income in 1963: manufacturing—39 per cent; agriculture—24 per cent, mining—21 per cent and tourism—16 per cent. In referring to these figures, Floyd Dominy says, "We would like to preserve that good balance by getting this project into being."

But the economy is not static. In contrast, Dr. Mann says that agriculture and mining constituted "20 per cent of the total income of the state in 1953. But manufacturing has recently overtaken both of these, and agriculture will probably continue to decline in relative importance. In the long run, mining will probably also diminish in importance as the vital ore resources are depleted."

However, "tourism has shown decided increases in the last decade." Consequently, I don't think it can be said that the economy of Arizona depends on CAP water when CAP's prime purpose is to bail out 0.6 per cent of the population and enable farm-related activities to contribute 24 per cent toward state income (or less than 20 per cent, depending on which source you prefer), a percentage, at any rate, that is on the wane.

It is this shift in emphasis that is not reflected by CAP. Tourism and recreational needs are treated as justifications for dams when indications are that the Grand Canyon without dams will better meet future needs. It is this failure of CAP, and the inexcusable failure of the subcommittee to hear the evidence in support of these conclusions, that arouses justifiably emotional protests from conservationists.

Here is a situation where private utilities do not want the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation extended to steam or nuclear power plants and where the B of R would find itself without a job if alternative methods of power production and financing were assigned to others. This situation is summarized by Secretary Udall's statement, "Water salvage in the West is tied historically to hydropower. Anything else would require a whole new type of reclamation program." In other words, whether or not the alternatives have merit has had nothing to do with the decision to ignore them.

A third major defect of the CAP legislation is the fallacious reasoning that hydroelectric projects pay for themselves. This theory is contested by modern economists, as evidenced by Stanford and Harvard studies (Fortune, April, 1965), and, I believe, is the content of Dr. Alan Carlin's testimony during the hearings on the Upper Colorado River Basin Project last month.

CAP is so obviously the product of the era in which it was originally conceived; its roots go back 30, 40, 50 years when its means and end were justified. Now, it fails in all its objectives: it will not provide enough water to replace overdrawal; its economic, mechanical, recreational and esthetic "underpinnings" do not measure up to modern standards. CAP is "old hat."

Sixty years ago there was a need to tame flooding rivers; today the need is to preserve what wilderness remains.

Mrs. E. B. Barnett.

No One Has a Right To Take the Law Into His Own Hands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson said last week some things that greatly needed saying. In Sunday's Washington Post the account of his speech was as follows:

Jeffersonville, Ind., July 23.—President Johnson warned sternly today that street riots and other disturbances jeopardize the reforms sought by civil rights leaders.

The President spoke out on street demonstrations at a luncheon for 450 business and labor leaders in Indianapolis. He warned:

"Our country can abide civil protest. It can improve the lives of those who mount that protest. But it cannot abide civil violence.

"Riots in the streets do not bring about lasting reforms. They tear at the very fabric of the community. They set neighbor against neighbor and create walls of mistrust and fear between them.

"They make reform difficult by turning away the very people who can and must support reform.

"They start a chain reaction the consequences of which always fall most heavily on those who begin them."

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I attended services at the National City Christian Church, where the President is an honorary elder. The President was in attendance with his daughter, Luci. We heard an excellent sermon by Dr. George Davis, touching sympathetically on the theme of the President's remarks in Indianapolis. In the church bulletin for the day, the following comments by this able pastor were included:

Ten Thousand Times Watts—One Thousand Times Chicago—The Imaginations of Early Morning

What is Watts multiplied by ten thousand, and Chicago by one thousand, all in one night? It was not a nightmare, not even a dream. I was wide awake at the time, at least as wide awake as a man could be at 3:30 a.m. I usually awaken early, and am generally an early riser. On that particular morning, the moment I came to consciousness, Watts and Chicago were in the focus of my consciousness, and so they must have been there in the unconscious in a marked way during the sleeping hours. But there seemed to be a countless number of Watts, and a countless number of the City on Lake Michigan. I think in my sleep I had been asking, "What if ten thousand areas in our nation's cities, and a thousand cities large and small were all in turmoil at once, in a single night, for several days on end perhaps, requiring large forces of policemen, large groups of soldiers, every National Guard in every state, at one and the same time?"

Of course even as I write now, there is news of last night in Cleveland, and New York, Jacksonville, South Bend, in turmoil. And the question, my friends, "Just where next?" Riot, pillage, burnings, looting, plundering, killings, all in the night's routine, here and there. And added to all this, law and order, and men who are assigned to preserve our society against anarchy, undermined by the eroding of respect for the police, laughed at, held up to ridicule. The places multiply two by two, three by three. But what if the number of places went up, until policemen, and national guardsmen were not sufficient to quell them? And what if the policemen and guardsmen being sufficient numerically, had lost finally and completely the morale required for the doing of their jobs because our society had finally and completely thrown regard for them to the "four winds"?

The Washington Post this morning, as I write, states in front page headline, "Cleveland Rioters Defy Guard Patrols" But that sort of thing had occurred with increasing frequency. Mr. Joseph Alsop this morning in his editorial pages comment, "Since the Civil War" writes about, "The American atmosphere this summer is heavy with warnings of an oncoming national crisis." Then he goes on with the usual admonition to all sides, but with the usual heavily aimed criticism of the police with the late Chief William Parker of Los Angeles as a central target. I am increasingly surprised that the police in any city are able to work at all, to maintain any order at all. If we are to speak of our war victims, and the victims of our highly pressurized society as having been "killed" by that society, because their hearts could no longer stand up under the pressures (and I think we may quite honestly say that of many men in the business world, in government, and of just ordinary citizens) then we may honestly say that men like Chief Parker were driven to their deaths, as their hearts gave in and under the pressures of a society which no longer supported them, let alone appreciated them, indeed a society which seemed to increasingly prefer disorder, violence, anarchy, a society gradually surrendering to what Dr. Karl Menninger in another connection years ago first called, "the death wish of man."

In a paper written on the title, "The Death Wish of Western Man," (based on lecture given at Stanford University this past February) I dealt at length with that "death wish." The paper reflected impressions gathered years ago from Dr. Menninger's book, "Man Against Himself." Our society reflects that death wish, among other ways, in our conscious or unconscious attack on the agencies and persons assigned the task of "preserving our society" in times of emergency and extreme peril, as well as their task of routine day by day watchful care over the "morally and criminally sick" in our society, and who day by day keep the ordinary channels of that society flowing, in such simple things as traffic.

We have behaved with very little intelligence, in our quest to bring justice and equality to all citizens, through civil rights, and in other areas, and in seeking to bring fuller justice even to our criminal population by protecting their rights too, by undermining our law enforcement agencies in the process. And that is exactly what we have been doing. One could go on at length to illustrate from the writing of all too many, such as Mr. Nicholas von Hoffman (Washington Post Staff Writer), as for example in his front page article of Tuesday, July 19, "Negroes Convinced That Watts Faces New Showdown With the Los Angeles Police." Throughout the article he undermines, as do many of his contemporaries the influence of the law enforcement agencies. Whatever his real point may have been (which he suggests was to point up the dreadful condition in Watts), what he really achieved was to "pull another rug out from under" the men who alone can give any security, anywhere, when "all hell breaks out." And when those men can't do it, next it will be the National Guard, as in Chicago, and Cleveland, and perhaps Jacksonville, by the time this article is printed. And if we some day find ourselves involved in "Ten Thousand Times Watts," and "One Thousand Times Chicago," and not enough policemen and guardsmen here at home, perhaps we could bring some of our men home from Vietnam to do the job. That would at the same time please the "peace beat-niks," the "ivory tower students and professors," "the sophomore doves" in our Senate who would rather debate than to open their eyes in the twentieth century. That would please all those who perpetually have the United States cast in the role of the "bad guys." For too much of press, radio, and television have assisted in creating that "bad guy picture." Some of the worst offenders have been some of the newspapers and TV and Radio Systems who boast of their greatness and size, and who claim they are "listened to and heard and read most widely."

For a good many months I have written and spoken, suggesting "we might reach the point of no return," in our marching, demonstrating, lawlessness. And I have "taken a beating" over that. But nothing in yesterday's or today's newspapers offer evidence that my view was incorrect.

I am conscious of the terrible problems we have to solve in this Nation. But I am growing weary of the constant, relentless attack upon the very centers of our society in the United States. It is not deserved, and it will only eventuate in the complete destruction of the foundations. I am not unconscious of the vast problems.

I dread the thought of children sleeping in rat infested buildings in Washington, D.C., as they do, with "rats nibbling at their toes" (as they do), and in many cities across this Nation. I remember standing on the corner at Thomas Circle, my first long, hot Summer here, five years ago, late at night, looking around (when Thomas Circle still had the slum look). And I remember standing on that same corner, my first Winter here, in the snow at night, looking around. I think I have never seen "such a God forsaken looking place," and beneath the majesty and beauty of the magnificent Church edifice in which we worship and work here. And then the Circle began to change. I remember when the first old buildings began to go down, watching the rats scurry at night. Twice I myself called the exterminators.

On the other hand, every dwelling torn down puts people in the street. And so housing remains a serious problem in big cities. I am not unmindful of the grave problems. I do not know what I would do if my family were caught in some of the traps known to some people. But I will not for one moment given encouragement by direction or indirection, by silence or by spoken word to "revolt" and "riot," and "anarchy" as the answers. And I will not for one moment go along with civil disobedience, and rebellion as the answer!

Vast progress has been made, was being made. It just could not all be done overnight, or even all in our lifetime. But it will never be done, in an atmosphere of anarchy, and violence, and it will never be done if we follow the ways of the Stokely Carmichaels, the Dick Gregorys, the Adam Clayton Powells, and the others of that frame of mind. It will never be done if we succeed in tearing apart the fabric of law enforcement, if we succeed in achieving anarchy. For Dr. Martin Luther King to deny that a part of the Chicago riots was planned, is to deny the facts.

The very man who has been in Chicago, Kansas City, and other large centers to teach the "art of resistance, riot, violence," came to Washington some months ago, brought here by some of the Civil Rights leaders. For some "unknown" reason, it was decided for the "time being," not to invite that man to "organize Washington," at least not openly. I sat in a meeting in our own Scott Hall some months ago, and heard one of the Assistant Ministers of one of Washington's large "white Churches" admonish his listeners that "all of us must cooperate with the revolutionaries," including that man I have mentioned above, if he came here "to organize." And not a single Minister in that listening audience raised a finger to object. I regret to say, I did not either. I think I was growing weary at that time of being "the lone voice" to raise a word of caution.

The Chicago situation is serious, as is Cleveland, Boston, Los Angeles, etc., etc., etc. But the answer is not with the "revolutionaries." And it never will be. To show you how cynical our society has become, no Administration has done more for the Negro than has the present Administration. No man has done more than President Johnson (and at the risk of political criticisms, and far worse than criticisms). Indeed President Johnson while he was Senate leader guided through Congress the first Civil Rights Bill in seventy years, and as a "Southern Senator." Laws are on the books (and I must in all candor say, some of those laws going to greater lengths than a good many serious people in our Nation think they should have gone) which hold answers to solving many problems. But the revolutionaries would not allow the nation "time to catch breath," time "to absorb." The revolutionaries kept pressing, marching, shouting, demanding. And to show you how cynical some of them have become, one need only listen to the violent words of men like Stokley Carmichael against the President; Mr. Carmichael's planned demonstration on August 6th, near the Catholic Shrine. I hope Mr. Hays of Ohio is able to get his Bill through Congress immediately to call a halt to such cynical, ridiculous, crude, sickening behaviour. And I hope the Nation becomes so sick of all of this, we will wake up to the "facts of life."

When men advocate "civil disobedience," out of the context of our kind of society, who declare that "the answer to black power" is the more radical revolutionary spirit of Jesus Christ, they are not being true to Jesus, to man's future. They have misinterpreted what the "revolutionary spirit of Jesus was." His spirit would not be at home, in some of what we have dared to relate His spirit to today. When a woman, a national religious leader declares that "Jesus was a tough guy," and thereby leaves an impression that Jesus was some "kind of Marlon Brando, James Bond, or dark street hoodlum" she has maligned the life of Jesus. And it is time for the Church to think straight, and for some of us to stop swallowing all of "this stuff we read and hear." You know of course, if you listen to me with any regularity, that I know you have the privilege to reject "my stuff" too. But I have the right to "be a part of the dialogue."

Mr. Speaker, certainly no one has a right to take the law into his own hands. What is bad for the Ku Klux Klan to do is bad for "black power" advocates to do. A militant black racist sat in my office several weeks ago and stated that if he and his followers did not get their way, law or no law, they could with a handful of people pitch the big cities into complete darkness by cutting off the electric power and then light the skies with burning buildings. He insisted that everything they ask in new laws should be enacted or America would take the consequences. That was not a very persuasive argument to me. In today's mail, I received the following sermon from Dr. Richard L. James, pastor of the Riverside Christian Church of Jacksonville, Fla., where I serve as an elder. This devout Christian and dedicated American said in his sermon of July 17:

"WHEN OTHER METHODS FAIL, KILL SOMBODY"

Scripture: Act 12:1–19.

Herod Agrippa I, was the grandson of Herod the Great. He was nephew of Herod Antipas, ruler of Galilee and Perea. Herod Agrippa I, was trained in Rome and was included in the influential circles of the Empire. His son, Agrippa II, was the one whom Paul appeared before in his plea for the Christian faith.

Herod Agrippa I, belonged to that school of thought which held that you can stop a cause by killing a few people. The book of Acts of Apostles records that he laid violent hands upon the church and killed James, the brother of John, with the sword. This action seeming to please the population, Herod had Peter arrested and thrown in jail. When Peter escaped and there was no other satisfactory way of placing the blame, he had the guards killed. In other words Herod operated on the principle that when other things fail, kill somebody! Never mind who, just kill someone! It does not matter whether or not death is deserved or the individuals are quilty, just kill somebody for the sake of the activity.

The very thought of such an idea is revolting to us. It repels us because we have learned through the long avenues of history that one cannot stop truth simply by murdering its children. The time for the spread of Christian faith had arrived on the stage of history. Polytheism and superstitions had served their day. Never again in the civilized world could they have the glory by which they controlled men's minds and bodies. The clanging of the hammer on the nails which spiked the hands and feet of Christ to the cross was the tolling of the bells for the funeral of the Empire's paganism. Kill all the Christians and still the old religions were dead. Herod could not stop that movement by killing James nor arresting Peter. The Christian faith was the idea whose time had come!

When Herod tried imprisonment of those who believed and prohibited their preaching, he thought likely this would stop them. When his commands and threats failed, he killed somebody. The method repels us because we have been trained to respect human life. We have been conditioned to the idea that human beings, just because of their natures, deserve better treatment. We are committed to the proposition that the death penalty is reserved only for those who have stood trial for their deeds and been found quilty.

One of the reasons I like to view "Gunsmoke" as a television program is that it has historical significance as we watch the conflict between the representatives of law and order on one hand and the gunslingers and criminals on the other. It is the battle between law and order and those who take the law into their own hands by mob violence, lynchings, shootings, arson, and other violent methods. In the old West, the due process of law won out and our nation came into being. However, each generation must fight this battle and the outcome decides what the next era will be like.

Today we are in the battle of the same nature as that which is represented by the U.S. Marshal of the old West. Our weapons may not be the fast draw with a pistol, but the battle goes on all around us. Whenever, for any reason, we decide to disregard the laws of our land, we choose our side in the battle. Whether the law be a simple regulation of safety, such as a stop sign at a busy intersection, or the more complicated regulations, they are all the symbols of our civilization which depends upon our respect and obedience for our survival.

Retired Justice of The Supreme Court Charles E. Whittaker, in a speech delivered at the University of Kansas in April 1966, said, "We must return to Law—or face Anarchy." Said Justice Whittaker, "Some would-be leaders have been voicing slogans and cliches which in instances, appear on the surface to be logical, and some even religious, but which, in truth, are neither. Instead they are dangerously deceptive and destructive."

Judge Whittaker then enumerates five of the slogans which are being passed around these days: "Government owes every citizen a living," "human rights, not property rights." "production is for use, not profits," "obey the good laws, but not the bad ones," and "action now, not the delays of the law." To each of these slogans, Mr. Whittaker gives some thoughtful answers. I am concerned here with the two which refer to our attitudes and respect for law and order in our land.

"Is not each of these cliches a call for anarchy?" asks Judge Whittaker. "Does not the fourth invite men to violate the laws they do not like? And does not the fifth invite men to spurn the courts and all constituted authority and to take the law into their own hands."

"If we allow men to disobey with impunity the laws they do not like, or to spurn the courts in all constituted authority by taking the law, or what they think ought to be the law, into their own hands, will we not be inviting anarchy and chaos?"

"The philosophy of 'obeying only the laws you like,' and of attempting to rule by force, has given rise to mobs and mob actions that have proven, as certainly as we should have expected, to be tailor-made for infiltration, take-over and use by rabble-rousers and radicals who are avowedly bent on the breakdown of law, order and morality in our society, and hence on its destruction. And we now see that virtually all of such 'demonstrations' are being infiltrated by rabble-rousers and radicals and, not infrequently, break into open violence."

Mr. Justice Whittaker continues with illustrations of violent action which has spread across our country until today it has reached the crisis-point, and concluded his remarks with an appeal for "a return to simple honesty, responsibility and forthrightness in our public speakings and writings, that they may honestly inform and not misinform the people, and for a return to an orderly society by requiring respect for and obedience to our laws by the prompt, impartial, even-handed, certain and substantial punishment of all persons whose willful conduct violates these laws, and that we do so promptly, and I would hope, before mass crime gets, as it surely can, so far out of hand as to be beyond the curbing capacities of our peace-keeping agencies and authorities."

So much for the problem before us today. As much as the violence represented by the philosophy of Herod repels us logically, too many persons subscribe to it by their actions. Whenever we become exasperated and confused and give way to angry actions we embrace Herod's way of life. In anger we strike somebody. We may not intend to kill, but many a murder has been the result of an angry brawl. Whenever we throw a rock, hit someone with a club or fist, we must be prepared for murder as the end result.

On the other hand, many persons who would not dare strike someone nor do violent physical harm frequently become frustrated in an argument. Not being able to win through logical reasoning, they give way to mental violence by calling the opponent bad names. Opprobrious labels are given to the person with whom we disagree. Instead of facing the issue and keeping it on a rational basis, we destroy character by attacking the personality, belittling the motives and destroying integrity of character. Whenever, our dislikes cause us to use hateful words and name-calling, we join up with the Herod mob.

This, of course, has been the basis for much of the world's warfare of past and present. Not being able to work out peaceful arrangements at the conference table, nor competing economically by fair methods, reason and good faith disappear and the armaments begin rolling.

However, some persons become so obsessed with hatred that they become the willing pawns of interest groups which see to it that such dislike is used to good advanage. Some persons in the midst of pressures laid upon them by interested organizations become an Oswald, pick up a rifle and slay their Kennedys. No matter how we go about the matter: by mob demonstration, irrational hatred and name-calling or by use of the rifle and shot-gun, we become henchmen of Herod whenever we do so. In contrast, we hear the words of Paul, the Apostle, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." As one muses upon the 13th chapter of Romans, there emerges from Paul's words the clear-cut thought and instruction that our behaviour toward men in general should be regulated by love. Whenever we become more concerned about methodology, or principles that we behave toward individuals through hatred and violence, we cease to have the Christ-like spirit and give way to the methods of Herod.

May I appeal to you today not to be like Herod. Do not allow wrath to find harbour in your life. Do not give way to violence. Do not participate in destructive activities. Rather, as those who have been redeemed by Christ, let us live worthy lives deserving of the great price which was paid upon the cross for our salvation. There are three things which I would suggest that we do and do with all earnestness and promptness.

First, let me suggest that we respect our nation. This is a good time for every Christion to give thanks for the blessings we receive simply because we are citizens of the United States of America. We should be proud of the heritage received from the founding fathers of the sacrifices of those who made religious freedom possible, of the hard-working, liberty-loving pioneers who developed our natural resources, and the system of economics which has made possible the inventions and industrial development which are a part of today's America. We should be proud of the abolition of slavery, of opportunity for self-advancement, of our school systems and our patriots who bravely fight throughout the world to maintain freedom for ourselves and other smaller nations. This is a good day to stand up and be counted as proud citizens and let the world know that we are glad to be a part of this nation "under God" with the fervent prayer that it shall never perish from the earth.

I would suggest further, that we obey the laws of our cities, states and nation. All the laws are a part of the complex system of government which is summed up in one glorious word, "America." No one can ignore any law nor deliberately violate it without doing injury to the entire land. There are no bad laws. Some laws may not be as desirable as others. Some laws may have passed beyond their usefulness. Changing times may have made some laws no longer necessary. However, a law must not be ignored. If the law is no longer necessary, we must work diligently to have it rescinded, but no one has the right to decide which laws he is to obey and which he may disobey.

Another and final suggestion I would make in all humility and seriousness is that we practice the law of love and thus fulfill the whole law. If we say hateful things about the citizens of our nation, be they in capacities of industry, labor, government, or whatever, we add to the contempt of the nation as a whole. Being a citizen of the U.S.A. is a very personal matter. We vote as an American citizen at the local polls. It is a face-to-face encounter with your neighbor and your peers. Your attitude toward them is a reflection of your patriotism. Your actions toward government employees is further evidence of your love of country. Hate them, renounce them, and you are to that extent renouncing the nation.

All of this is much more than patriotism. It is the Christian faith in action. The apostles and martyrs witnessed for the faith in the economic and political areas of their time as much as they did in homes. They carried their love and respect for ordained authority into the market-place, the political relationships as well as in church. The motivation for it all was expressed in the commandments of loving God and loving neighbor. When love is the motive of life, there will be no need to kill someone. For it is the nature of Christian love that it never fails. Love endures. If we give ourselves to this principle of life, there will be no need for us to become a member of Herod's society.

A Permanent U.N. Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce a House concurrent resolution to urge that the

United Nations develop permanent organization and procedures to enable it promptly to employ suitable U.N. forces for observation and patrol purposes in situations that threaten international peace and security.

This resolution does not ask for a huge standing U.N. army, but only calls upon the U.N. to adopt methods which will expedite peacekeeping operations in future situations similar to the Suez and Congo crises. This resolution is not to be seen as an attack upon the U.N. or a call for a radical new development that might alienate many U.N. members, but only as a helpful suggestion from those of us who believe that the U.N. has made a great contribution toward world peace and should prepare itself for even greater participation in the future.

A survey of past U.N. actions shows the need for some kind of permanent peacekeeping organization, instead of relying upon the present ad hoc method of starting from scratch on each crisis. In January 1948, the Security Council established a U.N. Commission on India and Pakistan to try to secure a cease-fire and plebiscite. But, due to delays in organizing a group, the Commission did not reach the area until the middle of 1948. However, once in action, it took a leading part in negotiating a cease-fire and a truce line.

THE SUEZ CASE

Organizational delays were also evident after Israeli and Egyptian troops clashed on October 29, 1950. A General Assembly resolution on November 4 authorized the creation of a U.N. Emergency Force. By November 7, the Secretary General had received offers of troops from 24 countries. A few U.N. officers reached Egypt on November 12, with the first troop units arriving 3 days later. The U.N. contributed a great deal in relaxing tensions in the Middle East but, according to Peter Calvocoressi, in his book "World Order and New States," done for the London Institute of Strategic Studies:

> The main lesson was that if the members of the U.N. wanted such operations to be undertaken, they should equip the organization with regular machinery before the next emergency occurred.

THE CONGO OPERATION

The U.N. was able to react somewhat more quickly in response to the Congo situation, but delay was still evident. The Security Council decided to intervene in the early hours of July 14, 1960. On the 18th, 600 U.N. troops reached the Congo. Within 4 days of the Security Council resolution, 4,000 troops had been pledged, 3,500 had arrived. The figure rose to 8,000 on the 26th, 11,000 on the 30th, and later reached 20,000 from 14 countries. U.N. action in the Congo succeeded in preventing the intrusion of the major powers into the heart of Africa.

Mr. Calvocoressi states:

> The U.N. succeeded further; to an astounding degree in the circumstances, in keeping the Congolese economy going, providing elementary services, alleviating disease, preventing famine, and protecting life. . . . On the first anniversary of Congolese independence, chaos had been contained, outside powers had drawn away and a parliament representing virutally the whole territory was about to meet in Lovanium.

The Congo could have become an international battlefield if no U.N. force had been interposed.

But even with this history of successful intervention, if another emergency were to arise tomorrow, the Secretary General would not know whether or not he could assemble a force, nor how long he could keep it in the field. Mr. Calvocoressi believes, this is the cardinal fault and until it is remedied peace will be ruled by coincidence.

ALTERNATIVES AVAILABLE

Given this state of affairs, what can be done to strengthen the ability of the U.N. to react promptly if called upon by the nations of the world? There is no present prospect of a permanent standing force. The larger powers dislike the idea of force being used in circumstances beyond their control and, if they changed their minds, the smaller states might accuse them of trying to create an instrument with which to discipiline the weaker members. The late Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold argued against a permanent standing force on the ground that the circumstances in which it might be employed are too diverse and unpredictable: the force would either be inappropriate to the next emergency, or it would have to be large enough and varied enough to cope with any emergency and thereby impossibly expensive.

But, given these limitations, U.N. capacities can still be strengthened. Units offered to the U.N. are not necessarily the ones it needs. Most countries offer infantry, which have limited usefulness in police roles unless they have very high standards of discipline. States willing to contribute have little idea in advance what they can most usefully provide. Some states have earmarked troops for secondment to the U.N. in a crisis, but they receive no guidance on training which thees units ought to be receiving. There is little information available at U.N. headquarters as to where to go at a particular moment to fill a precise requirement.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGE

Mr. Calvocoressi makes a number of specific recommendations for strengthening the U.N. reaction. He suggests a small, permanent staff at U.N. headquarters, with a chief of staff to make inspection tours of likely national contingents, and a staff college. The U.N. could work out a course of training suited to the most likely contingencies it will face. It could develop a uniform staff procedure. It needs an intelligence unit to provide information about terrain and climate in every part of the world. The staff college could create staff doctrines and a reserve of staff officers who had passed through its courses and returned to their own countries with some knowledge of how the U.N. works. Mobile communications teams should be continuously available. The U.N. might even have a broadcasting station.

ters, with a chief of staff, to make in-
procedure. It needs an intelligence unit

It is important that these and other suggestions receive publicity and study. House passage of this concurrent resolution would promote such an investigation. It appears that this move would receive the support of the American people since, according to a 1961 poll, a considerable majority of U.S. citizens were in favor of some kind of permanent U.N. emergency organization.

Mr. Speaker, some permanent procedures would facilitate the world's ability to respond to international crises by removing some of the delays which have hampered past U.N. action, thus providing a more certain mechanism for handling future threats to world peace.

Three Columns by Satirist, Arthur Hoppe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the all-American satirist, Arthur Hoppe, has returned from his vacation and three of his columns, published in the San Francisco Chronicle on July 13, 15, and 17, follow:

[From the San Fracisco (Calif.) Chronicle, July 13, 1966]

ELBIE JAY, FATHER OF THE BRIDE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Howdy there, folks, How y'all? Time for another tee-vee visit with the rootin'-tootin' Jay Family, starring ol' Elbie Jay—a hard-workin' feller who minds his own business. When he can find the time.

As we join up with ol' Elbie today, he's going over the guest list with his pretty wife, Birdie Bird. For their youngest tad, Myna Bird, is getting married. That's her, standing there wringing her hands, while the prospective bridegroom, Pat Somethingorother, looks on. Glumly.

ELBIE (heartily). My, that's a nice long guest list. I sure do like big parties. Now let's see here who's coming. Altwhistle? Baccigaluppi? Cravendish? Say, they certainly do have a lot of new fellows in Congress I don't even recognize, I must be losing my touch.

BIRDIE BIRD. Those aren't Congressmen, Elbie. They're personal friends of the children.

Elbie: Oh. Well, I think it's mighty nice to invite personal friends, Too. (As he reads on.) Yep, I'm for sticking with your personal friends through thick and thin no matter what they * * * What? Who's this here? You invite that mangy, low-down, two-timing, no-good polecat and the wedding's off.

MYRA BIRD. No, no, Daddy. That's William Y. Fulbright, a high school chum of Pat's.

ELBIE. Pat who?

PAT (nervously). That's me, sir. And I just want to say you're not losing a daughter, you're gaining——

ELBIE (scowling). A passle of your personal friends who're likely not old enough to vote. Well, I guess they can come. And you try to make it, too, son, you hear? Now, let's see, all we got to do to this here guest list is add the Congressional Directory, the Diplomatic Corps, the Press Club roster and leave us not forget my dearest friend, Hubert H. Whatshisname.

BIRDIE BIRD. Now, Elbie. You're escalating again.

Elbie (irately). I'm not either. I'm merely making a step for peace. 'Tween me and Capitol Hill. Now, then, as to the wedding itself, I better get to work on my speech.

Mynah Bird (near tears). Oh, Daddy, you can't make a speech in church.

Elbie (surprised). I can't? What are the folks coming for, then? You want to disappoint them?

Myna Bird. No, I want Pat and me to be united in a solemn ceremony in the silent presence of the Almighty.

Elbie (fondly). All right, honey. If you want me to be there and keep silent, I'll do it. It'll be a new experience. And seeing as how you're such a wonderful daughter, I'm a-going to change the seating arrangement at the wedding supper. You get to sit on my right instead of Senator Russell. Why, hang it, I'll even make a place for your boy friend there. Somewhere. My, I'm going to have a mighty fine wedding.

Mynah Bird (sobbing). It isn't your wedding, Daddy. It's mine.

Birdie Bird (firmly). She's right, Elbie. You must stop interfering.

Elbe (yielding graciously and putting an arm around Myna Bird). There, there, honey. You can plan the wedding (brightening). And I'll plan where we'll all go on your honeymoon. Let's see, Ohio's a swing state and * * *.

Tune in again, folks. And meantime, as you mosey down the long trail of life, remember what Elbie's old Granddaddy used to say:

"If'n you're the father of the bride, be happy you're gainin' a son. Think how he feels about gainin' you."

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, July 15, 1966]

Will Newark Sign a Separate Peace?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

En Route to Newark, N.J.—I am carrying a peace feeler to Newark, N.J. which just shows you the condition of world affairs today.

Actually, I had no intention whatsoever of carrying a peace feeler to Newark, N.J. That's a ridiculous idea on the face of it. I had intended to carry it to Washington, which is where we ace newsmen, diplomats, curio dealers and other collectors of peace feelers are supposed to bring them these days.

But then the airline strike hit and the only place I could get a plane to was Newark, N.J. I had already happily envisioned the triumph my peace feeler would bring me in Washington.

There I'd be, strolling jauntily up to the entrance of the State Department marked, "Deliver Peace Feelers Here," my peace feeler secure under my arm.

"What've you got there, another peace feeler?" the bored clerk would say with a yarn. "That's the fourth one today."

I'd casually hand it over. He'd wearily take out his magnifying glass, give it a cursory examination and then . . . "By George!" he'd cry. "This just may be an authentic Chinese peace feeler!"

With cool smile, I'd inform him that it was definitely an authentic Chinese peace feeler. I'd bought it myself in an alley in San Francisco's Chinatown from a shady, inscrutable character who sidled up, tugged on my sleeve and whispered sibilantly: "Psst! You want to buy genuine Chinese peace feeler, Mac?"

"By golly," the clerk would say in wonderment. "That does look like a genuine, hand-carved ivory handle and a live, authentic peacock feather. And what's this stamped on the bottom? 'Made in Peking.' Good heavens, I think it's the real thing."

Fine. I'd say. And now if he'd just reimburse me the $3.98 I paid for it . . .

"But what'll I do with it?" he'd say with a frown.

Why, I'd say, I assumed he'd take it up to the seventh floor and brush it across Mr. Rusk's sensitive antennae. Mr. Rusk would call Mr. Johnson and Mr. Johnson would . . . well, he'd . . .

At this point, if I know the State Department, the clerk would say there was absolutely nothing in the Procedures Manual for dealing with this sort of situation. He'd think about sending it down to Exploration for exploration. But nobody would be there. And finally he'd suggest I come back next week when he was on vacation.

So, after mulling it over, I guess it's just as well I'm carrying my authentic Chinese peace feeler to Newark, N.J., instead. If Newark wants to sign a separate peace, it's a step in the right direction.

Besides, the more I think about it, the more convinced I am that if anybody ever does manage to deliver a genuine peace feeler to Washington, nobody there would know what on earth to do with it.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, July 17, 1966]

The Eye on Luci's Back

(By Art Hoppe)

Washington.—Preparations are moving ahead for the simple family wedding of Miss Luci Johnson to Mr. Patrick Nugent.

Invitations have gone out to their 700 closest friends. The White House is issuing daily press releases. And we ace newsmen are foraging feverishly to ferret out yet-unpublished details for a waiting world. There aren't many left.

But through an incredible stroke of good fortune, I was able to obtain an exclusive interview with Mr. Homer T. Pettibone, president of The Pettibone Hook & Eye Mfg. Co.

"In the long history of Pettibone Hook & Eye this, I think I may say without fear of contradiction," said Mr. Pettibone proudly, "is our finest hour."

"The rumors are true, then," I said, my heart leaping up. "You did manufacture the hook and eye for the back of Miss Johnson's wedding gown."

"Only the eye," he said modestly. "The contract for the hook was let to a Texas firm. But we have been in constant joint-planning sessions to make sure one dovetails perfectly with the other."

"The challenge has been a grave one," agreed Mr. Pettibone, nodding somberly. "Not only did the eye have to be an esthetic masterpiece—a high water mark in American eye design—but it had to be faultlessly construed to meet the stresses and strains that will inevitably be placed upon it. You can imagine the dire consequences structural failure would bring." Mr. Pettibone shuddered. "On network television too."

Well, I said, it wasn't as though he was inexperienced in these ticklish jobs. I distinctly recalled the Nationwide publicity when it was revealed he designed the eye of Mrs. Kennedy's inaugural gown. Would he mind comparing?

"I certainly would," said Mr. Pettibone, glancing nervously over his shoulder. "But off the record, you might say the eyes of the previous Administration were perhaps more brilliant, more cosmopolitan, while the eyes today are most American, more sincere, more folksy."

I said I wouldn't quote him on that. And now could he describe for 190 million waiting Americans exactly what Miss Johnson's eye looks like?

"Good heavens!" cried Mr. Pettibone aghast. "That's top secret."

I looked so crestfallen that Mr. Pettibone relented. "Well," he said hesitantly, "I think it might be all right at this stage to reveal that the eye is, in general terms, round!"

After I'd thanked him profusely, he went off to appear on Meet the Press, Face the Nation and the Ed Sullivan Show, happily singing his firm's theme song, "The Eyes of Pettibone Are Upon You."

As for me, I set out to unearth the only other unpublished story—an interview with the man who made the hook. But I couldn't find him. I think the opposition has him stashed away in a roll-top desk.

Oh, well, it isn't every day we ace newsmen in Washington get a story like this. Even though it's every day we try.

Power of the Bald Eagle Is the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Donald R. Collins, D.V.M., of Topeka, Kans., does not hold with either the "hawks" or the "doves" in bringing about a settlement in Vietnam. He feels that we will have to depend upon the power of the bald eagle. His reasons for reaching this conclusion—and I am sure many will concur—are set forth in a letter to me. I think that this letter should have the attention of my colleagues. It is but the voice of one American, but it speaks for many Americans. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that this letter appear in the Appendix of the Record. The letter follows:

Topeka, Kans.,
July 19, 1966.

Hon. Chester Mize,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Chet: Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their countrymen!

The dove has taken its olive branch and flown. All that remains in the Valley of Freedom is that great hawk, the Bald Eagle. His sharp eye is fixed upon the main street of Hanoi. In sack cloth and thong sandals he sees men who believe that the starry flag they followed was the banner of the Free and the Brave. But the men are not free and you and I, apparently, are not brave! We can no longer withhold the powers of the Eagle with the excuse that in doing so we are saving American lives; American lives are being lost! We can no longer withhold the power of the Eagle with the excuse that his intimidations create fear or hatred throughout the world. America is already feared or hated throughout the world! Our only excuse now for withholding the power of the Eagle is fear for our own lives or hatred for our own weaknesses.

The issue no longer is whether or not we should be in Vietnam. It transcends the arguments Senator Fulbright and Secretary McNamara have over military policy. It revolves simply around a well known phrase and its counterpart . . . "Greater love hath no man than to lay down his life for a friend." The real issue is whether or not you and I, Friend, have as much love as those men in sack cloth and thong sandals . . . and, if we are brave enough to do something about it.

Because of our concern for history we must have reasons for making great decisions or attempting great departures. The reasons for unleashing the powers of the Eagle to end the Vietnamese struggle are at hand. Any demand which we wish to place on the North Vietnamese can now be made. To those Americans who must justify their actions to someone besides themselves, that justification now exists.

The presence of American flyers held captive in North Vietnam and now threatened with inhuman treatment, illegal prosecution and perhaps even public execution, gives you and me a most singular opportunity to bring peace to our time. It gives me the chance, once and for all, to answer the question: Is peace worth risking freedom for? It gives you the chance to answer the question: In a representative republic do those who represent still function as the voice of the people or has this land become the bureaucratic republic in which those who represent function only as the whipping boy of the people and the liaison of a dictatorial executive branch?

The American flyers in Vietnam, like Francis Scott Key, are looking across a great body of water and wondering, "Oh say, does that star-spangled banner yet wave, o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?" Our only answer to them and to the world must be this ultimatum by Congress to North Vietnam:

The sovereignty of American human rights and dignity has been desecrated by the parading of American flyers as a public spectacle on the streets of Hanoi. We would not treat our basest criminals in this manner. To have another country do so to our heroes cannot be tolerated.

The time for consideration has ended. If withdrawal of North Vietnamese troops and a firm appointment to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the disagreement over the Vietnams is not effected by October 1, 1966; or should American prisoners now held by the Government of North Vietnam be handled in any manner other than that prescribed for prisoners of war by the Geneva Convention; that is to say, should they be further displayed publicly as criminals of war, should they be tried as criminals of war, or should they be executed as war criminals, the Government of the United States shall, through its Armed Forces, neutralize North Vietnam by destruction of its war making industries, acquisition of its natural resources and annihilation of any of its people who resist. This will be done without reservation and by invasion and blockade.

Furthermore, interference by any nation in the world in these actions will be considered as a hostile act against the United States and dealt with accordingly.

Every man must make his own choice when the whole world hangs in the balance. I am too proud to sacrifice freedom, dignity and individuality at any cost, peace notwithstanding! I am as the Bald Eagle. This letter expresses my choice. I have the strength of conviction that faced with such an ultimatum not only North Vietnam but any country in the world would meet the demands. And ultimately prove that the powers of the Bald Eagle, not the virtues of the dove will bring peace to our time.

Best personal regards,

Donald R. Collins, D.V.M.

A Difficult Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, a young man in my hometown of Martinsville, Ind., was recently faced with a difficult decision: Should he accept a deferment from the Army, because of the death of his father or should he go ahead and be inducted.

He made his choice, and his letter in the July 21, 1966, Martinsville Reporter is one of the very finest statements of personal conviction, integrity, and dedication I have ever read. We should all be grateful to boys like Craig; upon them rests the hope of our survival as a free nation:

To the Editor:

Recently I received my papers to report for induction into the United States Army. I was quite surprised after failing my physical for enlistment last summer.

Last week I was offered a chance for a deferment because of the death of my father which left me as the eldest son capable of helping with the family in case of emergency.

The decision was left up to me to choose between staying home or going to serve my country.

The way I came to my decision is why I am writing to you.

Friday night, as usual, I came into town to get one of my buddies. He had a new album that he wanted me to hear so I went in to listen. I never caught the name of the album, but the words stuck in my mind. It was a protest song against draft dodgers and the description went something like this, "They are the ones who would never be caught dead with their eyes closed at public prayer. They wouldn't put their hands anywhere but behind their backs during the Pledge of Allegiance, or would they let the little ones hear them sing 'America' at the ballgame."

The communist cause does not have to fight us to win, they just have to wait until we rot in our own cowardice.

I might not get back, and if I do I might not find a fine job, another car to compare with the one I have now, or the girl I want, but I will be able to hold my head up and walk down the street.

I personally would be grateful if you would do an article to get my point across. Every boy has a responsibility to God, his country, and to his loved ones to do his part to make his country and their country a free one.

Thanks a lot,

Craig Savage.

Atrocious Crimes in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, F. F. McNaughton of the Pekin Daily Times, dated July 23, comments on a speech by British Foreign Secretary, Michael Stewart.

Secretary Stewart points out clearly the terror that the Vietcong have wrought in South Vietnam. He leaves no doubt that there is no balance of terror in that war-torn country, only the heavy weight in the deaths of key South Vietnamese. For those who believe that our bombing of oil facilities is inhumane, Secretary Stewart's presentation is must reading.

Under unanimous consent I include Mr. McNaughton's column in the Record at this point:

THE EDITOR'S LETTER

(By F. F. McNaughton)

The U. S. bombs key things.
Viet Cong kill key men.
Like Stalin killed key farmers.
Like Mao killed key Chinese.

To us has just come a speech made in Parliament by the British Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart.

American fliers had just bombed oil tanks. They had done it so skillfully that hardly a civilian was killed—as expertly as a surgeon's knife takes out a tumor.

But it caused angry cries from the Labor benches and from Yank haters in the House of Commons.

So Michael Stewart told them: "You are screaming about some careful bombing; but what about the cruelty that the Viet Cong has carried on for years?"

He went on to say: "There is a long story of the most merciless cruelty carried out by the Viet Cong over a long period of years. As far back as 1960, the number of persons, quite apart from operations of battle, being murdered or abducted by the Viet Cong was running at 6,000 a year."

By 1965 it was 9,000 a year.

In the first half of 1966, 5,000.

Secretary Stewart say it is important to note who these victims are. Not only are they civilians and unarmed, but they are particularly people who held any kind of governmental position, or positions of authority in their villages.

Stewart said their aim is: "To fill everyone with so much dread that he dares not take on a responsible position."

These continuing, cold blooded murders in South Vietnam all but prevent competent government. This, says the British Foreign Secretary, is one reason why the Geneva Agreement can not be fulfilled.

Whereas U.S. bombing of oil tanks may have killed watchmen, the Viet Cong are murdering mayors and other officials and civilian leaders of their communities at the rate of 10,000 in this year 1966.

Retardation Legislation: What It Means To Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

RETARDATION LEGISLATION: WHAT IT MEANS TO MASSACHUSETTS

(Representative John E. Fogarty, remarks to the Massachusetts Association for Retarded Children, annual convention banquet, White Cliffs, Manomet, Mass., May 22, 1966)

President Frankel, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am always pleased to visit my neighboring State of Massachusetts, and even happier to address the Massachusetts Association for Retarded Children at this convention banquet.

Actually, I feel somewhat humble to speak to citizens of this great State who have contributed such a great deal in the continuing battle against mental retardation.

It is rather an odd feeling to be standing here where the Kennedy family virtually started the great movements against mental retardation we are involved in today.

You can all be very proud of this State's Kennedy family, for it was from this State that John F. Kennedy traveled to Washington as a young Senator and later won the Presidency. As President, he fought, succesfully, to create a bold, new approach to mental retardation problems. He, and the panel of experts he called together, formulated the national plan to combat mental retardation that has meant so much to this State and to the country.

From this place, also, you have sent another young Senator, EDWARD M. KENNEDY, who is no less interested in furthering plans to conquer mental retardation.

As a Senator and as President of the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation, "TED" KENNEDY has the same spirit of action that his older brother John possessed. Upon his return to Massachusetts at the end of the last Congressional session, he quietly toured State schools and residential institutions for the retarded to gain first-hand knowledge of the problems they face.

As President of the Kennedy Foundation, "TED" KENNEDY, and other members of the family, have diligently worked to get retarded persons accepted as part of the national work force.

Their efforts have begun to pay off in recent years. For example, the Kennedy Foundation was instrumental in opening up an important area of employment for the mentally retarded—the Federal government. Prior to 1964, there were only a handful of retarded citizens working in Federal jobs. Then, in 1964, through the efforts of the Kennedy Foundation, the Federal Civil Service was persuaded to waive its usual written examination in cases involving the mentally retarded. Now the Civil Service Commission will accept mentally retarded workers if State vocational rehabilitation officials will certify that a retarded man or woman can perform certain jobs.

By the end of last year, this procedure had already resulted in more than 500 retardates being placed in Federal jobs as copy machine operators, messengers, clerical workers, and as custodial personnel in Federal buildings.

The Kennedy's were also instrumental in developing a model project to train retarded workers. Just last month, they saw their idea become a reality when the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration granted $149,000 to run the John F. Kennedy Flame of Hope Candle Project. Through this project, more than 1,200 mentally retarded workers will be employed to make hand-molded candles. It is hoped that this project will serve as a model for training the retarded for simple hand craft jobs in private industry.

Federal support for mental retardation programs, like the one under which the candlemaking grant was made, has been possible as the result of some major legislative developments over the past three years.

Mental retardation programs began to be truly effective in 1963, even though many of us in Congress had been calling for more Federal support since shortly after World War II. At any rate, the big push for action against mental retardation was started by President John F. Kennedy. In 1963, his administration put forward two bills which became milestones in the fight against retardation. These two bills, signed into law by President Kennedy, were "The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963," and "The Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963."

Under the program authorized by the maternal and child health and mental retardation planning law, over 50 States and Territories have completed initial planning for comprehensive programs against mental retardation. In addition, the same law has given assistance to insure better prenatal care for mothers in low-income areas, thus further combating a cause of possible retardation resulting from inadequate care during pregnancy.

Construction aid, authorized in 1963, has been initially successful. Advances made under three basic programs of this law include the following:

Community mental retardation centers—As of last December, two such centers had been approved for funding, and 175 other applicants were interested in receiving such aid. This program will gain momentum as State planning programs are more fully developed.

University-affiliated facilities—This program, to aid in the construction of buildings in which professional and technical training for mental retardation can be given, has so far received over 55 applications for grants. Nine of these have been funded with a total money value of nearly 17 million dollars.

Mental retardation research centers—Since the inception of this aid program, 8 awards, totaling nearly 20 million dollars, have been made to aid in constructing large, multidisciplinary centers to be used for research and research training in retardation.

Your State is participating wholeheartedly in the programs authorized by 1963 legislation. In fact, this year the State will receive 57,200 dollars for planning money, and a like amount next year.

Also, Massachusetts' institutions have received large awards for both university-affiliated centers and for research centers.

The Walter E. Fernald School in Waltham has received some 1.5 million dollars to help construct a retardation research center, and a community evaluation and rehabilitation center on the school grounds.

Working closely with the Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, and the Harvard Medical School, the research center at Fernald School will focus on basic research in retardation with scientists working in such areas as neurology, psychiatry, pediatrics, epidemiology, and the like.

The school's Community Evaluation and Rehabilitation Center will concentrate on diagnostic and evaluation procedures and will provide training for special education, psychology, social work, nursing, and other allied disciplines.

In Boston, the Children's Hospital Medical Center was recently awarded over 3.3 million dollars in Federal matching funds to help construct facilities for research and for a child development research and evaluation center.

Nearly 2.5 million dollars of the Children's Hospital money will go toward the construction of a large research center with research areas including experimental neurological sciences, behavioral sciences, genetics, and metabolism and clinical research. As at Fernald School, this medical center is closely-linked to the Harvard Medical School.

The Child Development Research and Evauation Center at Children's Hospital will be constructed as a two-and-a-half floor addition to Children's new outpatient building. This extra space will allow the hospital to increase its services to the mentaly retarded in Massachusetts and from surrounding New England States.

Besides the activities generated by the planning and construction acts of 1963, four other major pieces of legislation related to mental retardation were recently signed into law.

"The Social Security Amendments of 1965" authorize 2.75 million dollars, for each of the years 1966 and 1967, to assist the States in implementing retardation plans started with earlier Federal aid. This law authorizes further funds to help train professional personnel to care for the mentally retarded and other handicapped children. In addition, financial aid is authorized for the needy aged in mental or tuberculosis institutions, including the mentally retarded.

A second law passed in 1965 is "The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act Amendments of 1965." These amendments extend and expand programs for the training of teachers of handicapped children, and for research and demonstration programs related to training and teaching mentally retarded and handicapped children.

A third law—"The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965"—authorizes a three-year program of Federal grants to the States to improve the education of some 5 million children in low-income families. This will benefit those children who are considered retarded because of cutural deprivation.

Finally, fourth law—"The Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1965"—provides further aid to help rehabilitate retarded persons through vocational rehabilitation programs. Under these new amendments, programs for service and for rehabilitation facilities will be expanded and improved.

All of the legislation mentioned here will benefit the retarded and their families in Massachusetts and throughout the country.

In addition to these programs, however, the Federal government is supporting millions of dollars worth of research in various private institutions. The Federal government, through its own agencies such as the National Institutes of Health and the Children's Bureau, is also conducting far-reaching research and reasearch training programs aimed at solving the problem of mental retardation.

We in the Congress will continue fighting for new and better legislation to combat mental retardation, as will President Lyndon B. Johnson. President Johnson's own commitment to this fight was made very plain this year in his Health and Education Message to Congress. In that message he said, "We have begun to ease the tragic burden of the mentally retarded and their families . . . (and) . . . We shall continue our increasing attack on this problem. It deserves the concern and attention of our most able specialists . . ."

President Johnson then said he would appoint a new committee in 1966 to study new and better ways to attack mental retardation. In saying this, President Johnson followed the lead set by your own State son, John F. Kennedy, who created the first President's Panel on Mental Retardation several years ago.

Since the establishment of the original President's Panel, the Nation had made great advances in its attack on mental retardation. I think that now we would all agree even more with the words of President Kennedy delivered to the 1963 White House Conference on Mental Retardation: "We have left behind prejudice, superstition and ignorance which since the dawn of time distorted our thinking about the mentally retarded. We have entered a new era of understanding, hope and enlightenment."

Right To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the Sacramento Bee, Sacramento, Calif., expresses its pleasure with the recently enacted freedom of information bill—and its esteem for a favorite son, the gentleman from the Third District of California who was chiefly responsible for the legislation.

President Johnson emphasized anew the people's right to know when he signed the measure, the newspaper comments. And it finds reassurance in the President's insistence on openness in Government.

Many had a part in producing the legislation, the newspaper notes editorially, but in its words, "none more than Representative JOHN MOSS."

For the district and State he represents, the editorial says, the signing of the bill brings a great measure of pride in him and new respect for Government consideration of the public.

I would like to see this newspaper tribute printed in the RECORD, and so offer it:

PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW IS INVIOLABLE

President Lyndon B. Johnson emphasized anew the fundamental premise that the people have the right to know what is going on in their government when he signed the freedom-of-information bill defining that right.

As he said, a democracy works best when the people have all the information the security of the nation permits. No one, he insisted, should be able to withhold public information when that information is not dangerous to the security of the nation.

No one challenges the logic in holding secret any knowledge which might give an enemy nation an advantage or which would reveal to other nations important defense data. This is only a reasonable reservation and a calculation in the public interest.

However, the end aim of government in confiding the business of government is that insofar as possible an open society should be maintained; indeed, under the promises of the founding documents, this open society is a guarantee.

The legislation defining the people's right to know is the product of too many attempts within government to suppress information which legitimately is public information. Usually this could be traced to the oversensitive public official more concerned with the protection of his own private little empire within government than with his obligation to the public knowledge.

It is reassuring, moreover, that the President made it clear he intends to demand openness in government, to conform with the stipulations of the freedom-of-information bill. He said he is instructing "every official" in his administration to create the fullest access to information on government business in all cases where that information is not privileged. Without such execution, the law merely would be so many words on so many sheets of nice, clean, white paper.

Meantime, many in the two houses of Congress contributed to the producing of this legislation, but none contributed more than Rep. JOHN MOSS of the 3rd, Sacramento County, district.

As chairman of a House subcommittee on government affairs charged with investigating secrecy in government, Moss focused attention upon growing abuse within government of the people's right to know, and so minutely documented his case Congress responded with the passage of this new stipulation.

For Moss, the signing of the legislation into law by the President should bring immense satisfaction and some small measure of pride. For the district and the state he represents, it brings a great measure of pride in Moss and new respect for the government's consideration of the public.

White Moderates and Black Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN G. DOW
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, among all that has been written about the present racial unrest in our Nation, I find the following article by Mr. Tom Wicker one of the finest. This appeared in the New York Times of Thursday, July 21, 1966.

As other Congressmen know, we stand up for human rights while at the same time mail arrives from many who are unsympathetic to the Negro's plight.

I believe that Mr. Wicker's article puts the problem in sharp perspective, while still maintaining a considerate understanding of the opposing views involved. The article follows:

WHITE MODERATES AND BLACK POWER

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, July 20.—President Johnson, who has been an outspoken and effective champion of the civil rights cause, inadvertently exposed today the central difficulty of a problem that is becoming increasingly racial rather than legal, economic or constitutional.

At his news conference, asked about the rioting in Chicago and Cleveland, Mr. Johnson replied in the authentic voice of the white moderate. Negroes had to realize, he suggested, that they were only a 10 per cent minority, that by explosions of violence they were jeopardizing gains already made, that most white Americans believed in orderly and peaceful progress for the Negro, and that he personally would do everything he could to see that "equality is given."

THE PROPER COURSE

Thus, Mr. Johnson said, the proper course for "every citizen" was to "cooperate with constituted authority" so that progress could be made in an orderly manner.

All of this was true. Undoubtedly most white Americans and many Negroes—for instance, those who follow Roy Wilkens—believe deeply in what the President said.

The trouble is that as two summers of urban rioting and the emergence of the "black power" movement show, great numbers of Negroes realize all too well they are only a minority and believe it is precisely the democratic power with a small "D" of which Mr. Johnson spoke that has denied them their rights, equality, jobs and comforts for a full century.

The trouble is that while no citizens sharing plentifully in a reasonably orderly society—least of all its President—can advocate anything but peaceful and lawful change, great numbers of disadvantaged Negroes are convinced the record shows that kind of change to be too slow and too limited to offer them any hope in their lifetimes.

The trouble is that while cooperating with "constituted authority" is the essence of an orderly society—and "constituted authority" itself is what any President is sworn to uphold—ghetto Negroes facing sluggish and inept and sometimes corrupt city regimes, waiting for Federal programs that seem inevitably too little and too late, and living in states quicker to call out the National Guard than to move effectively against conditions, are beginning to see "constituted authority" as the enemy.

Three times Mr. Johnson spoke today of "giving" equality or justice or both to Negroes—gitfs which no one who calls himself an American wants to withhold. But the Negroes for whom they are intended not only have been waiting long enough to doubt the intention; as citizens, they also are wondering out loud why these things have to be "given" to them when they are the unquestioned rights of others. Viewed from this perspective, who is the lawbreaker—the man who takes his rights by violence or the man who withholds or stifles or trifles with the rights of others?

As for those gains that Mr. Johnson feared would be jeopardized, there has been no Negro rioting in the South where gains are visible and tangible—newly opened accommodations, newly integrated schools, newly registered voters, newly elected officials, even a scattered few newly convicted white civil rights offenders. In the great noxious city slums, what gains was Mr. Johnson talking about? More jobs? Decent housing?

Granted that it takes a long time to provide these things, let alone the more subtle evidences of social equality, promises will not long be an adequate substitute. And if the honest and needed promises of the white majority are not fulfilled with at least all deliberate speed, then who is jeopardizing what?

This is at the root of black power, no matter how the Negro leaders define it. "Constituted authority" is not performing well enough; the thought processes, the innate reactions, the interests of white moderation were born and nourished in a radically different environment from those of the rioters and the looters and the parents whose children's toes are nibbled by rats. To the one the established order is a friend; to the other it is oppression.

MILES TO GO

Yet, change and progress are always slow and inefficient in a democratic society; white moderates can no more remake themselves and their instincts than slum Negroes; and it does little good for either to preach at the other in a language he cannot understand about values he finds irrelevant or unworthy. Perhaps seldom before has it been so true that all Americans have promises to keep, and miles to go before we sleep.

Abuses Through the Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRENTISS WALKER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, upon my return from Vietnam, I was contacted by the press regarding my impressions of a situation involving the Neshoba County Hospital in my district, and its application for approval by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer medicare.

The following editorial which appeared in the Meridian, Miss., Star on Sunday, July 17, 1966, offers a warning that does not stop merely with the Southern States. It transcends all State boundaries.

I personally feel that the Great Society bureaucrats selected Neshoba County, already abused by the press and civil rights organizations, as the ideal locality for which to set an example in the application of their rules, regardless of the affect it will have upon the elderly, awaiting badly needed medical care. The people of Neshoba County are just as eligible to receive the benefits they have coming to them as anyone else in the country.

Further, this is merely one example of the way the Great Society bureaucrats can take one program and use it as a whip to make the citizenry knuckle under to other socialistic demands.

I urge my colleagues to heed this warning:

ENDANGERING LIVES

The Neshoba County General Hospital has been the cynosure of the nation's eyes concerning medicare for the past week. Some may feel it regrettable that such publicity has again been focused on Philadelphia and Neshoba County, but we believe the situation at the hospital has opened the public's eyes to the abuses being heaped on the South through the bureaucracy which surrounds the administration of the medicare program.

The Health, Education and Welfare Agency, through its refusal to approve the hospital for medicare, has now proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that the LBJ administration is bent on making slaves of all citizens of the Deep South—both black and white.

HEW has definitely endangered the health and welfare of those people—either white or colored—who are over 65 in that area, all for the sake of politics and the precious vote of the trouble-mongers. It is now known that HEW listened to the demands of Civil Rightists who wanted to keep medicare away from their own people.

It is further proof that medicare—which we were against in the first place—will be nothing but a political football anywhere in the nation.

Sooner or later, congressmen will hear the cries of outrage from their constituents about such abuse—the sooner the better. Whether they will heed these cries is another story.

We admire the courage of the administrative officials—Lamar Salter and the board—at the Neshoba hospital in their fight to gain what they believed was right for their patients. As taxpayers—paying the bill for medicare everywhere—we join them in their efforts to throw off the yoke of discrimination which HEW apparently wants to place on all hospitals in the Deep South.

Message From Senator Hugh Scott on Occasion of the Assembly of Captive European Nations' Dinner, National Press Club, Washington, D.C., July 20, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday evening, July 20, Hon. HUGH SCOTT, the distinguished Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, sent an inspiring message to those attending the Captive Nations Week dinner.

The wisdom and determination expressed by Senator SCOTT should be shared with all Americans, and all who love freedom throughout the globe. It is for this reason that I am making the Senator's words a part of the RECORD:

Unavoidable circumstances prevent my being with you tonight in person, but I want you to know that I am very much with you in spirit. Your cause has been my cause for many years.

Our era has witnessed the near total abolition of West European colonial rule over underdeveloped and divided areas of Asia and Africa. The United States supported and aided this great historical process because we Americans believe that all peoples are entitled to determine their own destinies. But our era has also witnessed the rise of a new and more insidious form of colonialism—the colonialism of communist imperialism which has engulfed many hitherto free and independent countries in East Europe. Just as we opposed colonialism in Asia and Africa, so too must we oppose it in East Europe. Not to do so would be a betrayal of our own basic ideals.

It is up to us to repeat, and to continue to repeat that we in the United States do not recognize oppression whether it occurs in Asia, Africa, Europe or in our own hemisphere. We must declare with renewed vigor our belief that the captive peoples of East Europe will one day regain control of their own destinies.

The captive peoples have faith that we will hold fast to that belief. I know that you will keep that faith, and you can be sure that I will.

HUGH SCOTT,
U.S. Senator.

Bob Jones Appreciation Luncheon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I call to my colleague's attention a recent event in North Alabama honoring one of the distinguished Members of the House.

The citizens of Limestone County, Ala., which borders Tennessee, honored Representative ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama, with a BOB JONES appreciation luncheon for his important contributions to the development of Limestone County and all of the Tennessee Valley.

It has been my privilege to serve with our respected colleague from Alabama on the Public Works Committee for a number of years. I have long admired his vast knowledge of resources, public works, economic development, and water resources; and I value and respect his skill as a legislator. Most recently, he demonstrated his concern for our area and the entire Nation in his work for approval of the Tennessee Valley Authority revenue bonding authorization.

The Limestone County event was the subject of an editorial on July 13, 1966, in the Huntsville, Ala., Times. I include the editorial as part of my remarks:

AN APPRECIATIVE LIMESTONE

Monday's luncheon in Athens honoring Rep. ROBERT E. JONES must have been a truly heartfelt attempt at appreciation. The efforts of the congressman have gone far in aiding Limestone County's attempts to carve ou a newer and much larger place in the economic future of the North Alabama area.

Specifically, the 200 Limestone County citizens were marking the success of the Eighth District representative's diligent efforts to secure a $1.3-million federal waterworks grant for Athens. And the efforts were obviously necessary if there is to be increased urbanization in the area—for such an increase must be predicated upon increased water development.

But the luncheon also provided an occasion properly to credit the congressman with introduction of a billion-dollar Tennessee Valley Authority revenue bond issue to aid in financing the world's largest nuclear-powered generating plant—another near-fabulous asset for tomorrow's Limestone County.

In short, keeping up with this JONES is quite a feat if you're a public servant intent upon watching your region progress.

The 14th Anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the month of July brings many national celebrations. On the Fourth, we mark our own independence from Great Britain. On the 14th, our oldest ally, the French celebrate Bastille Day. And today, July 25, I should like to take a few minutes to pay a special tribute to the unique partnership in self-government that was established in Puerto Rico, on this date, 14 years ago.

On July 25, 1952, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was formally proclaimed, and we embarked on one of the most progressive experiments in the history of American government. Today, 14 years later, I am proud to say that that experiment has been an unqualified success.

Through a constitution adopted by the people, Puerto Rico has provided her more than 2,500,000 residents a republican form of government guaranteeing the same freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press enjoyed by their fellow American citizens everywhere. But, as we all know, these most cherished freedoms represent only a shallow liberty if they are not accompanied by freedom from the ravages of poverty, hunger, and disease. This is the real test of a great society, and it is in this test that Puerto Rico has staked out a place of honor in the history of our hemisphere.

For through Operation Bootstrap, the program first conceived by the legendary Luis Muñozi, Marín, Puerto Rico has performed what is perhaps the economic miracle of the century. In the years since 1942, when the island's development program got underway, per capita income has risen from $120 to $905, illiteracy has been largely wiped out, and the best indicator of progress, the average life span, has jumped from 46 years to 70 years, while the death rate has dropped to a point lower than that of the mainland.

The machine that has transformed Puerto Rico from the reputation of the "Poorhouse of the Caribbean" to the "Showcase of Latin America" is the Economic Development Administration—or, Fomento. It is this agency that has stimulated private investment to the extent of more than 800 highly diversified and modern manufacturing plants. What this kind of industrial development can mean to an economy of a small island is best demonstrated by the fact that recently Puerto Rico's net income passed the $2 billion mark, and with this income, our partners to the south have purchased over a billion dollars in mainland products—almost as much as West Germany purchased with a population of 56 million people.

This fantastic economic success is not limited to manufacturing. With sugar production running at about 1,100,000 tons a year, agriculture remains an important economic cornerstone; and, as anyone who has ever had the pleasure of visiting this balmy paradise of the Caribbean knows, the tourist industry is very much responsible for a share of Puerto Rico's success story.

Today, then, Puerto Ricans have much to be thankful for and much to celebrate. But the task that Luis Munoz Marin set out to tackle a generation ago has not been fully completed. The work of Operation Bootstrap remains unfinished. Puerto Rico still has its problems. Poverty has not been eradicated for all, unemployment has been gradually rising, and a rapidly growing population will make these problems increasingly difficult to cope with in the years ahead. But what is important is that Puerto Rico has made an effort to solve these problems—an effort that has met with great success. Under the guidance of the beloved Munoz, and under the leadership of the new Governor, Roberto Sanchez-Vilella, and with the hard work and dedication of the Puerto Rican people, the island has prospered.

The success that Puerto Rico has so deservedly achieved attests to the benefits of the democratic way of life, and the anniversary of the Commonwealth constitution, which we honor today, represents the best American traditions of political inventiveness, belief in human liberty, and belief in government by the consent of the governed.

Again, on this Constitution Day, I should like to salute the people of Puerto Rico and wish each of them the best of life in the coming years.

The Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will take up H.R. 15765, the civil rights bill. We have an opportunity here to enact effective legislation to deal with many facets of our racial problems which have not been adequately dealt with in previous legislation.

Every section needs the careful consideration of all of us. We must be certain that the language is clear, and that it covers exactly those areas we mean to include. On Sunday, July 24, the New York Times discussed very ably two of the most important issues with which we are faced. I think the comments are penetrating, and believe my colleagues will find them useful in their deliberations on this bill. I would like, therefore, to insert the editorial into the RECORD.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

When the House of Representatives takes up the civil rights bill on Monday, it will have to make two difficult but crucial decisions.

The first is on Title IV, which is intended to stop racial discrimination in the sale and rental of property. This section as drafted by the Justice Department was excellent and needed no revision. Unfortunately, a bipartisan majority of the House Judiciary Committee yielded to the selfish clamor of the National Association of Real Estate Boards and approved an amendment offered by Representative MATHIAS of Maryland.

The purpose of the Mathias amendment was to exempt the sale of one-family houses and the rental of small apartment houses (four apartments or less) in which the owner occupies one of the units. This amendment would leave nearly two-thirds of the existing housing in the nation outside the scope of the bill and maintain the lily-white suburbs intact. Moreover, Representative MATHIAS told reporters that his amendment would permit a real estate broker to discriminate against Negroes when requested to do so by the seller of an exempt property.

Attorney General Katzenbach last week advised a Senate committee, however, that the amendment would exempt owners only if they themselves tried to sell or rent their properties. A broker would not be legally immune if he discriminated, even though he were acting under instructions from the owner. Since most property is sold through real estate agents, Mr. Katzenbach's interpretation renders the Mathias amendment relatively innocuous. The test for the House will come if Mr. MATHIAS attempts to strengthen his amendment to make it possible for brokers to discriminate.

The second critical test on the bill concerns the Judiciary Committee's insertion of the seemingly innocent and honorable word "lawfully" into Title V. This section of the bill is designed to punish acts of violence against civil rights workers and Negroes which occur when these persons are exercising their constitutional rights. The insertion of the word "lawfully" in this context tears a great, gaping hole in the bill.

Over and over again, civil rights demonstrators in Southern towns have been arrested for loitering, jaywalking, trespassing, or parading without a permit. Because a man is jaywalking, should he be teargassed? Because a man is "trespassing" on public property, should he be beaten with nightsticks or set upon by police dogs? It was precisely to prevent such violence, much of it committed under the thin color of legality, that Title V was drafted.

The bill has several excellent provisions, notably the improved procedure for nondiscriminatory selection of jurors. It could be further strengthened by providing financial indemnification in cases of death or injury resulting from civil rights activity. But the protection of the housing section against further enfeeblement and the restoration of the antiviolence section to its full effectiveness are the challenging decisions now before the House.

Unions in the War Against Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed by an article by Thomas Cosgrove in a recent edition of Communities in Action, published by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Unions and union leaders are particularly equipped to be helpful, and I believe that Mr. Cosgrove has performed a valuable service in letting the public know what the AFL–CIO leaders have done to promote and encourage the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Much remains to be done, and I certainly hope that union participation will be continuing and even widening. The article follows:

UNIONS IN THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY

Scratch almost any union leader and you will find he was once poor himself, that he believes a union is a democratic device by which its members, largely, have lifted themselves out of poverty . . . and further, that he and his organization have an obligation to help others help themselves.

For these reasons the AFL–CIO and other unions support OEO programs through political and legislative activities. They also support many other measures which are part of the larger war on poverty. These include civil rights, increased unemployment compensation, adequate workmen's compensation, higher social security and welfare benefits, regional development, programs to increase the number of jobs available, increases in the minimum wage, Medicare and other legislation aimed at helping the poor and other Americans.

AFL–CIO leaders have been involved in OEO from the very beginning. A. Phillip Randolph, president of the Sleeping Car Porters, and Miles Stanley, director of the AFL–CIO anti-poverty office, are members of OEO's National Advisory Council.

David Sullivan, president of the Building Services Employees International Union, is chairman of OEO's Labor Advisory Council and 12 other top trade union officials are also council members.

Many local union officials, nearly 2,000, now serve on governing boards of local community action agencies.

A dramatic example of union leadership in CAP development has unfolded in Cincinnati, Ohio. There, Al Bilick, head of the local AFL–CIO Labor Council, served as president of the city's Community Action Commission in its first year of operation in 1965. Bilick's organization was already deeply involved in community problems before OEO came into existence.

In 1963, Cincinnati labor and civil rights groups staged a successful march for jobs and freedom. Following the lead of Congress' inquiry that year into the nature and extent of poverty in America, Cincinnati's City Council was urged to conduct its own investigation by those mobilizing the jobs and freedom campaign.

Theodore M. Berry, then a Cincinnati city councilman, and chairman of the council's welfare committee, headed this investigation. When the Economic Opportunity Act was signed into law, Berry became director of Community Action Programs for OEO.

Thus with labor supplying much of the push, Cincinnati launched its own Community Action Program within weeks after the anti-poverty legislation became national law.

But labor's involvement in the War, as Bilick points out, goes beyond the broad outline of community action in Cincinnati or in the nation. He said, "Job training programs directly concern us and we are involved."

To follow through on the basic issues of employment, the Cincinnati AFL–CIO Labor Council co-sponsors a unique program with the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the city's rehabilitation division.

This project puts together skilled union craftsmen, crews of youngsters and owner-residents of rundown houses in poor neighborhoods who qualify for rehabilitation grants of up to $1,500 from the Federal Housing Administration.

Four local unions of painters, plasterers, carpenters and cement masons supply craftsmen who, paid at the prevailing union rate, serve as foremen and instructors for crews of boys age 16 to 22, who receive $1.25 an hour.

This program has been so well received the Labor Department is now being asked to approve an expanded two-year operation.

Out in California, the Alameda County AFL–CIO Central Labor Council has also concentrated on the job problem. This county includes the city of Oakland.

In May of 1965, the council submitted a plan to OEO for a twelve-week summer job project for the employment of 200 jobless youths in various types of community work, all under supervision of the Labor Council.

Last June 9, the OEO approved a grant of $235,000 for the project.

A project director and staff of supervisors and foreman-instructors were hired, largely from the ranks of retired or unemployed union members, and a list of proposed work projects was obtained from community nonprofit agencies.

Job applicants were sought through schools, church organizations, the state employment service, welfare rolls, youth centers—and police records. Requirements were: age 16 to 21, family income of not more than $4,000 a year for a family of four (less for a smaller family) and willingness to work.

The task of recruitment was an agonizing one. In less than three days, nearly 700 had applied for the 200 openings. Some 200 were finally chosen, 140 boys and 60 girls.

Nearly a third were on parole or probation or had previous police records—the sort of kids who nine times out of ten would be rejected by traditional social agencies. Most came from families receiving public assistance. A high proportion were school dropouts. About 90 per cent were Negro.

With few exceptions, the young workers tackled their tasks with zest and hustle. The work, and the prospect of regular $1.25-an-hour wages, seemed to promote new feelings of self-respect, ambition and responsibility. Many opened bank accounts for the first time in their lives. They began to dress better, both on and off the job. A supervisor of a group of girls reported that her charges had matured remarkably in just a few weeks—"no more gum chewing and bubble popping, and they've gained a new respect for themselves and each other."

Not the least significant aspect of the project was the effect it had on the foreman-instructors. Harold Wilson, the labor council's community services director who acted as overall project coordinator, reported:

"We conceived this project with the idea that experienced working men could guide kids in proper work channels. This has happened just as we foresaw. What we didn't foresee was how deeply the experienced workers would be affected, too. They've come to understand these kids and their problems; they've gotten not only involved but enthused."

Another typical union-inspired project has 45 young men undergoing training as surveyor's aides in a Neighborhood Youth Corps project sponsored by Operating Engineers Local 545 in upstate New York and the New York State Department of Public Works. They have been doing so well most of them will be put to work before they finish their scheduled 21 weeks of instruction.

The project was developed by Local 545, with help from the International Union, to fill a widening shortage of men qualified to work in surveying gangs. Instruction is given by experts from the union's ranks.

Another interesting union-backed program is the custodial training project of the Building Services Employees International Union in Washington, D.C. This is a pilot project sponsored by BSEIU and its locals 82 and 536 in cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education.

"Our main purpose in sponsoring this school," says BSEIU President David Sullivan, "is to secure jobs for unemployed workers after they have completed the 12-week course."

"The school represents a concrete effort to support the War on Poverty. If it is successful, we hope to establish similar schools in other cities."

Every day, the students make their facilities sparkle. They are learning the techniques of efficient cleaning from experienced teachers. And, in remedial education classes, they are brushing up on English and basic math.

On the work skills side, they learn how to "strip" a floor, use mops and waxes, operate buffing machines and clean rugs and windows efficiently and carefully.

These trainees used to be "hardcore" unemployed or chronically unemployed. They don't plan to be any more.

Unionists are workers with skills to offer, and some are offering them free. Many are among the 2300 VISTA Volunteers who are giving their time, energy and concern to poverty programs of all sorts throughout the country. There is also some union involvement in the Job Corps now and strong prospects of unions taking a very large part in many Job Corps camps.

One of the most interesting programs involving unions and OEO was described by Sargent Shriver at the recent AFL–CIO convention in San Francisco. This is the Appalachian AFL–CIO trade union program which includes training and a year of community action work for 100 leaders of AFL–CIO city, county and state councils in ten Appalachian states.

The 100 people now in training at the University of West Virginia will return to their communities after their initial two-week program is completed.

"We could like to have the program in half a dozen different parts of the United States" Shriver told the AFL–CIO convention, "in the iron range area, in the northeastern states, in the Ozarks, in the West, in the Rocky mountains and in the South."

The programs described above and a dozen others in development indicate a very fruitful expanding union involvement in all aspects of America's War on Poverty.

But of course some of the poor see unions as just another part of the establishment which is holding them back. In fact, in the area of discrimination in employment, some of the poor hold unions responsible for discrimination against minority groups. Of course unions don't have any voice whatsoever in who most employers hire, but they do have some influence in the building trades, where there have been some problems.

The national leadership of the AFL–CIO is working hard to help end discrimination.

"Segregation in unions is no better than segregation in schools, and we hope that the problem will be eliminated in a short period of time," Donald Slaiman, AFL–CIO Director of Civil Rights, recently said.

"Not only do we urge segregated unions, on the basis of AFL–CIO policy, to merge with all possible speed, but we also notify them that these laws exist," Slaiman said. "We tell them that they are subject to complaint (for discriminating) and that the law is being violated."

Some progress in this area has been noted by Ben D. Segal, of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. He has said:

"For instance, there are eight Negro apprentices and several journeymen in the electrician's local here in Washington. Just a few years ago there were none."

And last month the AFL–CIO and the National Urban League joined hands to help prepare Negro youths for apprenticeship training in unions. Another similar project was set up earlier in Chicago by Building Trades Unions together with employers, the federal government, the city government and civil rights organizations. So there are indications of progress.

It should now be clear that AFL–CIO leaders are in the OEO effort to the hilt. Together with OEO they are combatting discrimination and poverty by participating in planning at the national level and implementation at the local level.

AFL–CIO President George Meany recently wrote:

"The time to end poverty is now—in the decade of the Sixties. The means are available; they need only to be used."

—THOMAS COSGROVE.

Public Office and Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, many years ago when I decided for the first time to run for office, I sought counsel from an old friend of the family, a judge who had been on the political scene for half a century.

Upon learning of my interest in entering into politics, he looked up at me with a wry and wise smile and said:

> Young man, if you would just put one-tenth of the effort that you will in running for public office into selling old mops and brooms, you will be a millionaire.

His comment returned to me the other day when I read a very excellent editorial in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Tribune. It is a most thoughtful analysis of an increasingly controversial area of the political life. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and to all good and honest men of public spirit who are hesitant about embarking upon what many of us consider one of the most noble careers of all, that of public service.

The editorial follows:

PUBLIC OFFICE AND BUSINESS

It's amazing how badly some people want public office.

Not only will they spend several grueling months running breathlessly from meeting to meeting, shaking hands and making speeches, but they subject themselves and their families to various sorts of indignities.

The latest evidence of the sacrifices which candidates are willing to make is revealed in the financial statements of the gubernatorial hopefuls. On the apparent theory that the public must know the most intimate details of a candidate's life before he can make an intelligent choice, several of the candidates have made full confession of their assets.

It is true that such disclosures can show where potential conflicts of interests might occur, but this is hardly any guarantee of integrity. The mind of man has an infinite capacity for figuring out clever ways of wrong-doing, and there certainly are ways in which an office can be corrupted which would never be reflected on such financial statements.

The public announcements of assets also raises an interesting question: "In politics, is it better to be poor or rich?"

There was a time when persons of wealth were considered a political liability; the "common man" approach seemed a surer road to success at the polls.

Today, however, there seems to be an undercurrent running which states that you cannot really trust a man who is financially insecure; consequently the candidate with the most worldly goods would be the least likely to succumb to the temptations of selling the favors of his office.

There is no evidence to support such a theory. It could be argued to the contrary that the person resigned to living on modest means doesn't have the appetites which require frequent infusions of new wealth.

We should rejoice that despite that distasteful aspects of campaigning there are many able and qualified persons willing to seek public office. We hope the demands made of them will not be such to drive the most able out of public life, leaving only the opportunists and self-seekers.

A 16-Year-Old Writes to Our Men in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, last week I received two wonderful letters from a young lady in my district, Miss Jeanne Pierce. One of the letters was addressed to me, the other to our men in Vietnam.

It was my pleasure to forward Miss Pierce's letter to one of the men from my district who is serving in Vietnam, and I am sure that he will pass it around for many of his comrades to see. However, I would like to insert the letters here so that all of us might know Jeanne's thoughts, which are highly commendable.

The letter follows:

KINGSPORT, TENN.,
July 20, 1966.

Congressman JAMES H. QUILLEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You have been so kind and considerate in the past. I would like to ask you one more favor.

Would you please see that my letter gets to any soldiers anywhere in Vietnam. It doesn't matter what branch of the service. I think you can get it there. If it isn't possible, thank you for your efforts.

You're doing a great job up there!

Sincerely,

Miss JEANNE PIERCE.

KINGSPORT, TENN.,
July 19, 1966.

DEAR MEN: I can't call you "boys" because I don't believe anyone who has fought for his country remains a child.

I don't know anyone personally in Vietnam, but you are all Americans so I really know and love you all.

You must get darn mad when you hear about all those ridiculous draft card-burnings, beatnik demonstrations, and so on. I get boiling!!

Sometimes it scares me to see what is happening to America. Good ole' flag-waving patriotism is seldom seen now. God is being removed from the mainstream of American life—or so the Commies and athiests think. But they are sadly misinformed—you can't throw out God by abolishing prayer in school!

I imagine God seems sort of alien out there sometimes. It's hard to think of God in connection with blood and bullets and death. But He's out there with you—believe that. Never lose faith.

Maybe some of you are from Tennessee or Mississippi. Those are the two states I know most about. I was born in Jackson, Miss., and lived there until three years ago.

East Tennessee, where I live now, is beautiful country. I live atop a ridge—Chestnut Ridge and from here you can look down upon the town. When I look out my bedroom window, I see other mountains, all green and covered with summer foliage.

I'm sixteen and for two years I've been trying to do something for you who are serving our country on far-away battlefields. A teen-age girl doesn't have much influence, you know.

But I do have one thing—a marvelous Congressman, JAMES QUILLEN. I hope he can get this to you.

I don't even know whether you want this letter, or if it does any good. But I wanted to write it.

Just remember—you are not forgotten. We here at home, most of us, except for a few stupid kooks, love you, respect you, admire you, support you, pray for you, believe in you.

Keep up the good work! If there is anything special you all need, maybe you can get word to your families. I mean, I know you can—but if they won't send it, I will.

Someday I hope to meet some of you—what an honor for me!

JEANNE PIERCE.

U.N.'s Spendthrifts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House just a little over a week ago passed the foreign-aid bill with its very liberal provisions for funding U.N. projects, I believe an editorial from Chicago's American of July 23 deserves the special attention of House Members and therefore I insert it in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

U.N.'S SPENDTHRIFTS

The nearer to bankruptcy the United Nations comes, the more it seems to increase its spending. A special committee of experts in finance from 14 countries has issued a report urging the U.N. to cut back its growing number of conferences around the world and also to curb its frantic passion for issuing voluminous documents.

U.N. meeting in New York, Geneva, Switzerland, and elsewhere have almost doubled in the last six years while the U.N. goes deeper and deeper in debt. More than 7,000 meetings have been scheduled for this year, and the cost of issuing documents has risen in six years from 13 million dollars to 26 million.

The committee recommended that Secretary General U Thant reduce the number of conferences to fit the visible resources, but Thant is not likely to do it. Everybody at the U.N. thinks Uncle Sam will come to the rescue again as he has before, and that extravagance need not be controlled.

We suggest therefore that the best way to get economy in the U.N. is not through appeals by committees, but through a flat announcement by Ambassador Arthur Goldberg that the United States hereafter will pay only its just and agreed proportion of the U.N.'s expenses.

California Assembly Joint Resolution No. 29

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the past I have called to the attention of my colleagues in the House a proposed Bureau of Reclamation project which would be of great benefit to central California. It is the San Felipe division of the Central Valley project and would be authorized for construction by my bill, H.R. 777.

For the benefit of those who will be called upon to vote on this matter, hopefully in the not too distant future, I commend to your attention California Assembly Joint Resolution No. 29 which follows:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 29—RELATIVE TO THE SAN FELIPE DIVISION OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

Whereas, It is the purpose of the San Felipe Division, Central Valley Project, California, to provide, among other things, irrigation and municipal and industrial water supplies, conservation of fish and wildlife resources, and enhancement of outdoor recreation opportunities within the Counties of Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz and Monterey; and

Whereas, The proposed San Felipe Division will make use of a tunnel to be constructed from San Luis Reservoir westward under Pacheco Pass into said service area and will, by reason of its location, harmonize with and assist the State of California's water plan; and

Whereas, There exists at present in said service area a drastic shortage of underground water; now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to expedite authorization of the San Felipe Division, Central Valley Project, California; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Chairmen of the Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Address of Congressman Lester L. Wolff, Captive Nations Week Dinner, National Press Club, Washington, D.C., July 20, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be present on Wednesday, July 22, at the Captive Nations Week dinner here in Washington at the National Press Club. On this occasion, sponsored by the Assembly of European Captive Nations, a plaque in honor of the Unknown Freedom Fighter was presented to Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, president of the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa.

This plaque was presented to Congressman Lester L. Wolff and me during Capitve Nations Week exercises held last year at the United Nations in New York City. Therefore, I was particularly proud to participate with Congressman Wolff in the presentation of this symbol of freedom for the captive nations to the Freedoms Foundation, its new and temporary home. I say that this plaque will reside only temporarily in Valley Forge, because last year, it was decided that it should be lodged permanently in the capital of the first satellite nation that is freed from the Communist yoke.

On the same occasion, celebrating Captive Nations Week 1966, Congressman Wolff addressed the Assembly of European Captive Nations. His words were so moving and so inspired that I want to bring them before all Americans by making them part of the Record. I could not state Congressman Wolff's qualifications to speak on this crucial subject any better than they were stated by Chairman Vaclovas Sidzikauskas upon his presentation of the ACEN Medal and Scroll to my New York colleague:

> It gives me great pleasure to present, on behalf of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, our Commerative Medal and Scroll to Mr. Lester L. Wolff, Representative from the 3rd Congressional District, New York.
>
> After a distinguished career, which included participation in U.S. Trade Missions to the Phillipines in 1962 and to Malaysia and Hong Kong in 1963, Mr. Wolff was elected to Congress in November 1964. Since his election, Representative Wolff has consistently and unflinchingly given his full support to the captive peoples of East-Central Europe in their struggle for freedom and self-determination. Both in Congress and in other forums, Congressman Wolff has continued to bring to public attention the plight of captive East-Central Europeans suffering under Communist tyranny.
>
> In recognition of and gratitude for Representative Wolff's record in defense of freedom, the Assembly of Captive European Nations begs the Congressman to accept this Medal and Scroll as a token of its appreciation.
>
> Speech of Hon. Lester L. Wolff
>
> It is a real privilege for me to speak tonight before this most respected organization—an organization whose members know perhaps better than anyone else the true meaning of Freedom.
>
> Today, we stand at a crossroads. The past has been tragic for us all since the tyranny of Communism enveloped some of the proudest nations of the earth. Yet the future will inevitably be brighter, for a day will surely come when the liberty we enjoy in the Free World will be shared by all.
>
> We meet here tonight on a fateful anniversary. Last Saturday was the 21st anniversary of the convening of the Potsdam Conference, where the free world first began to realize how coldly, determined, were the Russians in their goal of world conquest.
>
> Within a few years of that fateful meeting, nearly one billion men, women and children lost their most precious possession—their freedom—because of the ambitions of the totalitarian Soviet state.
>
> Untold millions have suffered now these many years under the yoke of Communist servitude.
>
> We live in a time when American attention is riveted on the fight for freedom in Vietnam.
>
> Yet, important as that struggle may be, it is equally important that Americans remember the unhappy fact that the Captive Nations of Eastern Europe are still captive—that their freedom is still to be won.
>
> The ruthless grip of Communism has not relaxed in Eastern Europe. Freedom is still a word from the lexicon of a happier past.
>
> Men still lose their lives in attempts to pierce the Iron Curtain to freedom. The heavy hand of the state is felt in all aspects of daily life in the Captive Nations.
>
> There is no freedom of speech; and ill-advised word can still bring the dreaded knock in the middle of the night.
>
> And there is no freedom of the press. The only information disseminated to the people is the propaganda churned out by the puppet regime and its master, the Communist Party. The only way those in the Captive Nations can learn the truth about the world in which they live, the truth about their own country, is by furtively listening to the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe.
>
> And there is no freedom of religion despite claims to the contrary, for Communist ideology is Godless.
>
> Red anti-semitism is but one example of the true intentions of the Communists, which is to erase religion and God as a competing force to Soviet tyranny.
>
> Their campaign against God has been a miserable failure.
>
> In captive Poland, the Catholic Church has survived, under the brave leadership of Cardinal Stefan Wyzynski, even as the Communists continue to show their enmity to the Church, by refusing to allow the Pope to visit Poland to celebrate the Millenium of Christianity in that land.
>
> In Hungary, Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty remains the symbol of defiance and courage.
>
> Throughout the Captive Nations the spirit of religion has been repressed, but it has not been crushed.
>
> However, religious freedom is not the only victim of Communism.
>
> Within the Captive Nations there are no free elections. The puppet regimes would never dare to test their popularity by allowing the people a free choice.
>
> For history has taught that whenever men enjoy free elections, they always vote for an increase in freedom. Free elections in the Captive Nations would bring an immediate end to every single puppet regime imposed by the new Russian imperialism. And the Russians know it, for there has never been a single nation where a free election has resulted in victory for Communist candidates.
>
> Men are by nature free; they will never consciously choose oppression.
>
> Tonight we are proud to entrust with Mr. Wells, of Freedoms Foundation, temporary custody of the beautiful plaque which was presented to Congressman Horton and me last year.
>
> We hope it will not long remain at Valley Forge, the home of Freedoms Foundation.
>
> We hope it will soon find its permanent shrine in the capital of the first captive nation to be liberated from Communism.
>
> My friends, the past has taught us many lessons. If we remember them, the day of liberation will not be far off.
>
> We must remember, that even today when men talk of detente, the Communists continue to see the world as a struggle between two forces, with only one essential question: "Who will survive?"
>
> Yet there is growing evidence that the Red Tide, unleashed across the world by the Russian Revolution, has passed its crest.
>
> I believe that we have good cause for optimism about the future.
>
> I'm optimistic because the Communists will not prevail by force in Vietnam.
>
> I'm optimistic because the Communists admitted the failure of their economic system to provide for the needs of their people when they built the Wall across Berlin.
>
> I'm optimistic because the Communists have failed notoriously in Asia, especially in India and Indonesia.
>
> I'm optimistic because the Communists have failed in Africa where even their toehold has been lost.
>
> I'm optimistic because they have failed in Latin America where Fidel Castro, who perverted the ideals of his nation's revolution for freedom, has been trying for over seven years to export his poison to other nations in the hemisphere.
>
> And, I'm optimistic because I believe it is only a matter of time before Communism begins to crumble in the ancient states of Eastern Europe now held captive.
>
> In fact, the process may have already begun.
>
> For the force that holds the Captive Nations in bondage today is none other than a modern day version of traditional Russian imperialism, and such a force, relying on violence and hypocrisy and slavery has never been able to permanently prevail.
>
> It has been almost ten years since the brave freedom fighters of Poland and Hungary fought to the death against overwhelming odds.
>
> There are, and there will be, I assure you, other men just as dedicated to the cause of freedom.
>
> For God did not will that men should live in slavery.
>
> Just as Abraham Lincoln said that the United States could not exist half slave and half free, history will bear out the prediction that our world will not continue half in submission and half in freedom.
>
> Because all men are brothers, as long as one single man is a captive of Communism, a part of each and every one of us is captive.
>
> May the freedom that is the birthright of all men soon come again to the Captive Peoples. Their courage and sacrifices have won for them a special place of honor among the world's champions of liberty. To you members of the Assembly of Captive

Nations the world's thanks for continuing to carry the torch of freedom—let us all remember the plight of the oppressed people of the Captive Nations and help keep the torch burning.

Robert M. Hamady: Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a story from the June 26, 1966, Flint, Mich., Journal and the July 21, 1966, Stars and Stripes, which honors my constituent, Mr. Robert M. Hamady, for his sincerity and generosity to right a wrong for 68 wounded veterans of the Vietnam conflict.

The stories follow:

[From the Flint (Mich.) Journal, June 26, 1966]

FOOTED BILL—VFW GIVES CITATION TO HAMADY

The man who footed the bill to throw a special party for 68 wounded veterans of the Viet Nam conflict has been cited by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Robert M. Hamady, president and treasurer of Hamady Brothers, Inc., Flint, threw the party for the veterans after the Conrad Hilton Hotel refused the veterans reservations for an ice show because of "fear it would depress the other hotel guests."

Hamady anonymously picked up the tab for the party in Chicago after making arrangements through the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Andy Borg, national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars issued the citation of appreciation for Hamady and it was presented to him by Cooper T. Holt, the executive director of the VFW's Washington office and former commander in chief of the VFW.

About 3,000 delegates are here for the annual Michigan convention of the VFW.

[From Stars and Stripes, July 21, 1966]

CITATION FOR MAN WHO GAVE PARTY FOR VIET NAM VETS

The man who footed the bill to throw a special party in Chicago for 68 wounded veterans of the Viet Nam conflict came to Grand Rapids from Flint to accept a citation from Commander in Chief Andy Borg of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for his kind deed after the Conrad Hilton Hotel had refused the injured veterans reservations for an ice show for it would depress other hotel guests.

Honored with an appreciation citation was Robert M. Hamady, president and treasurer of Hamady Brothers, Inc., a chain of supermarkets with offices at 3301 South Dort Highway, Flint. The citation of appreciation was presented by Cooper T. Holt, executive director of the VFW's Washington office and a former commander in chief of the VFW who represented the National organization of overseas veterans at the Michigan Department's 47th annual convention banquet held in the Civic Auditorium.

The Flint grocery chain operator telephoned Commander in Chief Borg after reading about the hotel incident in the Flint paper. He told the commander that he too felt the boys should have a special party and after hearing that one had been planned for them at the nightclub of their choice, Hamady asked just one thing: "Would you please give me the honor and privilege of paying for this party?"

In making the offer, the Flint businessman made only one stipulation—that the party should be put on in the name of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and that he be given no personal publicity.

After the party had been held and turned out to be highly successful, Commander Borg said he had only one regret and that was that the man honored at the VFW convention in Grand Rapids was not on hand to witness the pleasure of those 68 wounded veterans.

The commander in chief asked that Hamady be contacted to see if he would accept public thanks from the VFW at the Michigan convention.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S. decided to give their own party for the wounded men even though the public apology demanded by Commander Borg from the hotel chain was forthcoming.

A number of Flint area VFW people attending the annual banquet at the Civic Auditorium said that Hamady had always been most generous to veterans in donations to raise funds for community betterment projects.

Speech Before the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations—Hon. Frank Horton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague Mr. HORTON recently delivered an address about the captive peoples of Europe before the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations in Rochester, N.Y. I commend it to the attention of this distinguished body:

SPEECH BEFORE THE AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE ANTI-BOLSHEVIK BLOC OF NATIONS, HIGHLAND PARK BOWL, ROCHESTER, N.Y., JULY 23, 1966, BY HON. FRANK HORTON

In a poem entitled "My Testament," Taras Shevchenko, the Ukranian poet of freedom wrote:

> "Oh bury me, then rise ye up
> And break your heavy chains
> And water with the tyrants' blood
> The freedom you have gained."

Thus, was the immortal love of freedom expressed from the heart of Shevchenko. It is appropriate that we remember and reflect on the poetry of Shevchenko this evening, for we are the people who must breathe life into his hope for freedom in Eastern Europe and for men everywhere. I want to talk to you tonight about where the hope of freedom for the Captive peoples now stands, and about what you and I must do to brighten that hope.

Communism holds captive the peoples of Hungary, Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Albania, Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Armenia, Ukraine, Yugoslavia, and its Serbian, Groatian and Slovene peoples. But, the Captive Nations are not confined to Eastern and Central Europe. There are many once-free countries in the Soviet Union and Asia where the lamp of liberty no longer burns. And, as close as 90 miles to our United States shores, the Communist tyrants are in command in Cuba.

To say that this situation which enslaves the minds of millions is distressing is an unbelievable understatement.

Yet what steps have we, as Americans, taken to free the minds and lives of these millions, many of whom are members of your own families? How strong a stand have we made in Europe to let these people know that the hope for their freedom is safe in our hands? If we compare where freedom stood at the close of World War II and what its status versus communism is today, the contrast is frightening indeed. The shadow of Red conquest has fallen over vast new areas of the world, once-held superiority in weapons is being reduced to a mere balance of military power, and unquestioned support for our policies from freedom's friends, our "allies," has deteriorated to an attitude of "let's negotiate."

While Americans at this hour are valiantly defending Asian frontiers of freedom with their very lives, the picture in Europe is far less bold and far less bright. Ten years ago, when the Free World failed so dismally to answer the call of Hungary, which had its Red regime in shambles, ie became clear that the United States intended ony to contain Communism, but that we would not stick our necks out to free people who were already captive. This was a sad decision for many Americans to swallow, indeed, there are many in Congress like myself who refuse to abandon our determination to win freedom for these people. But sadly, Administration foreign policy makers seem to have abandoned this obligation. In fact, there is now serious question whether even our containment objective in Europe is holding fast. At least in 1956, when we left the Hungarian revolutionaries to fend for themselves, we had a strong and viable defense structure in Europe.

Today, I have serious doubts about the unity and strength of NATO. As I told my colleagues on the floor of the House of Representatives a few weeks ago, we cannot lay all of the blame for the split in NATO at the feet of the French. Pointing the finger of blame at General De Gaulle will not strengthen or improve the Free World Alliance in Europe. We would do better to look at the trend of our own policies. When I spoke in the House on this subject I pointed out that the United States has practically receded from its former position of leadership of the Atlantic Alliance.

We have not made a single policy initiative in Europe since the Multi-lateral Nuclear Force concept failed two years ago, despite the fact that our initiative has never been more desperately needed than in the last two years. With the Nations of Western Europe maturing once again to economic prosperity, and growing further and further from the Nations of East Europe, it is essential that someone continue to hold with determination, the threads of common interest and purpose which bind the Free World together. That someone must be the United States, for since World War II, our Nation has been rightfull regarded as the Free World spokesman in the Cold War alignment. But despite our determination in other areas of the world, our initiative and leadership have been woefully lacking in Europe.

I said at the beginning of my talk that I would tell you where the hope of freedom for the Captive peoples now stands, and that I would suggest what we could do to brighten this hope. I think I have demonstrated to everyone here how very much the hope for freedom in Eastern Europe needs brightening. Far from urging a strong American determination to free these Nations, our people today are seriously questioning our justification for pursuing even a policy of containment in Asia. While the majority of Americans do see the need for holding the line in Viet-Nam, the dissension on this issue gives us an idea about the uncertain attitude of many toward Communism.

If we want to change the policies that have contributed to this bleak prospect for freeing the Captive peoples, we must reharness the attitudes of the American people toward Communist rule. We must reawaken all Americans to the duty of this Nation to bear the standard of the Free World in protecting freedom, and in extending it to enslaved areas of the globe. When I say that *we* must reharness these attitudes, I mean every one of us here tonight and throughout the country who holds high the ideal of freedom for all men. I mean every one of us here tonight and throughout the country whether or not we have personally gone through the ordeal of Communism, whether or not we witnessed how Communism can stifle a nation and enslave a people who once enjoyed a full and vibrant life and culture.

I mean every one of us, first or fifth generation Americans—because you and I have a common heritage. Our roots were nurtured in the same fertile soil—that of Western Civilization. You and I are the products of that Civilization, and we all bear the characteristic of Western background which stands out most in each of us in the love of individual liberty. It is this characteristic longing to be free which binds us together in a common mission—our mission to propagate ideals of freedom.

As former citizens of the nations of Eastern Europe, who can recount first hand what life is like under the boot of Red power, Americans of Eastern European derivation should make it their primary task to educate the American public about the realities of Communism—about barbed wire, about the need for complicated papers and passports to travel only a few miles, about censored news media and about controlled education. It is not enough to repeat over and over the evils of Communism among yourselves. Many of you are here in this country because you were determined to resist totalitarian forces in the old country.

Today, there is apathy in America about our policy, or our lack of policy toward Eastern Europe. It has become old hat to talk about Captive Nations and Communist totalitarian society, just as among some of our American citizens freedom has become old hat. But for people who have seen both America and Communism, there is nothing old hat about Freedom. I know how actively you cherish the rights and privileges of residing in the United States.

But this country will never take a strong stand against established European Communism as long as Captive Nations Week is celebrated by immigrant groups alone. While you, by yourselves, can exert pressures on American policy through the channels open to all citizens, the strong and effective response will only come when all Americans, whether or not they were born in or descended from Eastern Europe, show an active concern for the freedom of your peoples. Captive Nations Week must be a time for all of us to demonstrate our concern, and our disappointment with present appeasement of Red regimes.

You, having had the benefit of seeing both sides; you, to whom Communism is much more than a few words in the newspaper, must go out and reawaken Americans, those you work with and deal with, those who share this State and this community with you. You must communicate to them the realities of totalitarianism which many of your own relatives are now enduring. You must relate your experiences and your comparison of life under freedom with that under enslavement with your fellow Americans at every opportunity.

Captive Nations organizations and nationality groups like those many of you are active in must work together in this task of re-educating Americans. Disputes and prejudices that are left over from the old country must be buried, for the sake of a united effort in getting this urgent message across to our people.

Since I have been your Representative, I have done my best to get this message across to our people and to our leaders.

I hope most of you know that my very first official act as your Congressman was to introduce a resolution calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Ever since, I have continued to work for the adoption of this resolution.

Congress should have a special body to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations, to report to the American people on the oppression which exists in the Captive Nations, and to make recommendations for effective policies to return freedom to these freedom-loving lands.

Such an official examination could help to expose Soviet propaganda and reveal the real role of Communism. This action would demonstrate our sincere good faith and conviction to help the captive peoples once against enjoy self-determination.

In addition to the moral principles which inspire this proposal, we owe the people of these nations a great debt. We owe them our support in return for the efforts of the refugees of these countries who have helped build the golden greatness of this Nation. For as you and your countrymen have contributed to the ideals of freedom and independence here, we must come to the aid of those now in your homelands or the lands of your ancestors. They deserve our renewed dedication to the cause for which they live: free government.

Bringing this special Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations into being will not be easy; it will require the same determined reawakening among Members of the Congress.

I have introduced another resolution which would put the Baltic States question on the United Nations agenda. The brutal and illegal annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Russians and the deportation and death of hundreds of thousands of their people was a crime against humanity. It should be considered and condemned officially by the nations of the world.

This year, I think we have one of the best opportunities we will ever have to reawaken Americans to the plight of the Captive Peoples. 1966 is the Tenth Anniversary of the valiant Hungarian revolution. The Committee is working diligently to plan suitable events and publicity for the commemoration across the country. I know that here in Rochester, an exciting commemoration is planned for this October.

In addition to working with the Citizens Committee, I have introduced a resolution to provide for a memorial to the Hungarian Freedom-Fighters in Washington, D.C. By erecting a suitable monument to the most valiant attempt at throwing off the chains of Red rule, we can assure the preservation of the spirit of Freedom of the Captive peoples in our Nation's Capital.

Three nights ago, it was my privilege to present a plaque, honoring the Unknown Freedom-Fighter Against Communism, to the Director of the Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge, Pennsylvania. This plaque was presented to me last year by the Assembly of Captive European Nations during Captive Nations Week Ceremonies. Eventually, this plaque will be enshrined in the Capitol of the first captive nation to be liberated from Communism. In the meantime, placing this plaque at the Freedom Foundation's Headquarters in Valley Forge will serve as a fitting reminder to Americans of the task that lies ahead.

Through these and other activities, I am trying to do my part to convey the cause of Freedom from sterile Communism to all Americans. I have told you already that there can be no improvement in our Government's policy without a demand for improvement by the great majority of our people. Our goal must be to communicate the need for stronger ties in NATO; and above all, to communicate the realities of life under the Red boot to Americans so that they will understand the fatal flaw in appeasing Communist regimes.

Freedom is the only form of government that can sustain itself without force. The peoples of the Captive Nations want freedom and are prepared to risk their lives in order to secure its blessings.

I don't want to leave you with the impression that the only hope of freeing people who have been subject to Communist rule lies in strengthening our military deterrent in Europe. In a world which has had twenty years to consider the dangers and responsibilities of the nuclear age, we must look beyond a mere showing of military strength for the solutions to international problems. There is no question that NATO must be strengthened, and that its purposes must be rejuvenated, but we must also re-orient our alliance and our policies to the world as we find it twenty years after World War II, and 13 years after Stalin.

If we do succeed—as we must—in reawakening Americans to the necessity of winning freedom for all men, we must harness this reawakening to accomplish more than just a "harder line" toward Communism. We must build a determination and a love for freedom so strong that when Americans say that they seek *peace* along with universal freedom, the world will sit up and listen. We must build a determination so strong that even the Communist rulers will have *no* choice than to consider seriously our demands—not at gunpoint, but across a conference table and through diplomatic channels.

Freedom is contagious, and when faced with demands for freedom in a world where freedom reigns, and in a world where men cherish their freedom, even the Red rulers of the satellite nations must bend with the tide.

Hand in hand with our quest to reawaken America to its blessing of democracy and to the curses of totalitarianism, we must work toward a reawakening of the world to this blessing. There has been very little progress made in loosening the Communist yoke in Eastern Europe, but there has been some. Travel in most of the Captive Nations is a little freer. Russia has turned a little toward providing consumer goods for her citizenry. Hungary has opened its door a crack to outsiders, and has allowed some Hungarians to leave.

As these tiny cracks widen slowly, we must kindle the lamp of freedom in our country so brightly that it will shine through these cracks enough to let everyone behind the Communist curtain know about the rights and privileges we as citizens of the free world enjoy. If we are successful in our task, these bright rays of light will serve as rays of hope—acting as an irresistible wedge in the iron door of Communism.

But we cannot make this wedge work if our own citizens are apathetic. If freedom in our minds is only a dim glow which we take for granted, it can never penetrate the cracks of the Iron Curtain. But when we are determined, and when we are proud of our way of life—not timid and afraid to show our pride at the risk of annoying Red governments—then demands from the American people that freedom be granted to Red subjects will be heard and answered.

I have tried, through every means at my disposal to speak up about freedom, and to demand that it be given to Captive peoples. Since World War II, despite the Cold War, much progress has been made in freeing many of the world's people. Colonialism is now almost extinct in Africa, and most of the newly independent states on that continent were willingly freed from colonialism by their Mother countries in Europe.

We must demand that the Communist masters in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe act now to free the people held captive in these countries. The Red masters must recognize and respond to the desire of their people to be free, just as the colonial powers have freed their colonies in Africa, Asia and Latin America. If we are to have a peaceful world, these demands must be heeded. For as long as there are human beings living in closed societies under censorship and oppression, there will be turmoil and conflict among nations.

Our government must call upon Red leaders to answer the demands of these millions for freedom—to open their borders and their social and economic structure to the free exchange of ideas and the free movement of people.

To my knowledge, the resolutions I have introduced voicing these demands have fallen on deaf ears behind the Iron Curtain.

I shall continue to introduce resolutions and to write letters and to speak out whenever a man is persecuted or a prayerbook is burned. I shall continue because I believe that we can rejuvenate the determination that will breathe meaning into the words of my resolutions, determination that will carry this meaning to the ears of the oppressors.

The same determination will inspire our own Government to voice similar demands to Communist leaders. The United States through diplomatic channels and publicly must make clear our intention to stand up for the victims of this Communism. But these demands will be meaningless if they are backed up only with weapons and the threat of nuclear attack. We cannot realistically threaten the world with war and destruction in the name of freedom—for then we will be little better than tyrants ourselves. We can, however, and we must bring to bear upon the oppressors the most powerful weapon available to us—freedom itself.

A steadfast lamp of freedom shining over the Berlin wall, through minefields on the Hungarian border and through the jungles of South Asia is a far more potent force to the Communists than any other.

I am asking you tonight to help keep this lamp burning and intensify its brightness until the light of freedom will shine throughout the world.

Justus F. Craemer: 1886–1966—California Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of California's greatest citizens—Justus F. Craemer—has left our midst. This kindly gentleman will be sorely missed by his many, many friends. His service to mankind has left an extraordinary mark on the "sands of time."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one last eulogy to this good man, couched in the brief and pointed obituary printed in his own newspaper and the fine sermon delivered at his funeral—thereby recording for posterity in the Halls of Congress, the life story of this "good and faithful servant."

The obituary and sermon follow:

[From the San Rafael (Calif.) Independent-Journal, May 25, 1966]

Justus F. Craemer, chairman of the board of California Newspapers, Inc., since it bought the San Rafael Independent in 1937, died in his sleep early today at Ross Hospital. He was 79.

Craemer had been hospitalized for over two years, with a complication of ailments incident to age. But until his health failed, he was known affectionately to his many friends as "fire engine" for his unflagging energy and endless supply of ideas.

NINETEEN YEARS ON PUC

He served for 19 years on the California Public Utilities Commission, was a candidate in 1942 for the Republican nomination for U.S. Senate, served as assistant state director of public works, state building and loan commissioner, and as a member of the State Fair Board. He was also active throughout his long life in the Lutheran Church.

His greatest activity, though, was in the newspaper business, in which he became interested when he became half owner of the Orange News soon after completing his education at University of California.

He was born in Fort Dodge, Iowa, Oct. 18, 1886, son of a Lutheran minister, Rev. John Lorenz Craemer. His grandfather, Friedrich Auguest Craemer, came to the United States from Germany in 1845 as a missionary to the Indians of northern Michigan and later was president of Concordia Lutheran Seminary in Springfield, Ill.

His father died when Craemer was only 4 years old.

He was graduated from Fort Dodge High School and Tobin College in Fort Dodge.

FLIP OF COIN

The flip of a coin brought him to California. In 1907, he had the choice of attending either University of California or University of Pennsylvania. He tossed a coin, and California won.

Craemer came west with a close, boyhood friend, William O. Hart. The youths played basketball together their first year at the university, organizing their class squad. Play came to an end for Craemer one day when he broke a bone in his heel. The injury laid him up for several months and brought his college career to a close.

In the spring, Hart and Craemer went to Southern California where Craemer's grandmother owned an orange orchard in Orange County.

Craemer worked in a packing house in Orange and Hart took a job on the local daily, the Orange News.

In 1909 Craemer headed for the Yukon, but the cold weather turned him back to Seattle where he took a job in a wholesale paper plant. Soon Hart was urging Craemer to go south again and buy a half interest in the Orange Daily News.

Craemer borrowed $1,300 from his grandmother and $700 from a bank and became co-publisher of the newspaper. Craemer handled the business end of the paper and Hart ran the editorial department. The two worked in close harmony. There was never a written agreement between them. There did not have to be.

Craemer's first of many political jobs began in 1923 when he was appointed to the State Fair Board, a post he held for five years.

GOVERNOR'S AID

In 1934 he served as private secretary for Gov. Frank F. Merriam. He was assistant director of the State Department of Public Works in 1935–37, state building and loan commissioner in 1937–39 and a member of the California Public Utilities Commission from 1939 to 1956. He served as president of the commission in 1942.

In that year Craemer organized the Mountain Pacific States Conference of Public Service Commissions and headed the organization until 1946. He also served as president of the National Assn. of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners in 1948–49.

In 1937 Hart and Craemer joined Roy A. Brown to purchase the San Rafael Daily Independent. The three-way partnership continued until 1942 when Hart was killed in a commercial airline crash.

Hart's estate purchased the Orange Daily News in 1946 and Craemer took over Hart's interest in the Independent.

Brown and Craemer brought about the merger of the Independent with the Marin Journal on Nov. 30, 1948. The move brought nearly 50 years of journalistic sparring in Marin to a close.

When the papers merged, the combined circulation totaled 13,000. Today's circulation of the Independent-Journal is 40,650.

Craemer was the last survivor of the three men who took over the Independent in the organization that became California Newspaper Publishers, Inc. Brown died March 9 of this year, after serving as publisher ever since the purchase in 1937.

LONG SERVICE

During his lifetime, Craemer received honors and recognition for his long public service. On the eve of his retirement at 70 from the Public Utilities Commission, he and Mrs. Craemer were honored at a reception in San Francisco Civic Center.

In 1960, Gov. Edmund G. Brown presented Craemer a gold card in recognition of 50 years newspaper service in the state. In 1956, Gov. Goodwin J. Knight gave him a silver medal in honor of his long service to newspapers.

He was president of the California Newspaper Publishers Assn. in 1929, the National Editorial Assn. in 1932 and the California Press Assn. from 1943 until 1964. He served as vice president of the latter for 20 years. He also served as a director of the Inter-American Press Assn.

Craemer was a former director of the First National Bank of Orange, the Federal Finance Co. of Santa Ana, the Orange Building and Loan Assn., and the California State Chamber of Commerce. He was a member of the Republican State Central Committee in 1936–38.

When the state chamber was organized in the early 1930s, Craemer became its Southern California division chairman.

In Marin County, where Craemer had lived since 1951, he served as public relations chairman for the Marin United Crusade. He also served a term as director of San Rafael Chamber of Commerce.

In 1957, he headed a statewide committee in a successful campaign against a proposition designed to end tax exemption for nonprofit schools.

He was also a member of the Orange Rotary Club, the Press-Union League of San Francisco, the Jonathan Club of Los Angeles, the Family Club of San Francisco and the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco.

He and his wife, the former Agnes F. Fitzsimmons, were married Jan. 6, 1915.

He is survived by his wife, of 50 Canal Street, San Rafael; a son, Justus J. (Jack) Craemer, editor and co-publisher of the Independent-Journal; his sister, Helen Craemer of Orange, and five grandchildren, Justus Theodore, John Frederick and Janine Elaine Craemer and Kenneth and Goeffrey Justus Ashley, all of Greenbrae. A daughter, Mrs. Barbara Craemer Ashley, preceded him in death.

Funeral will be at 2:30 p.m. Friday at Trinity Lutheran Church, San Rafael, of which Craemer was an active member. Private burial will be directed by Harry M. Williams Mortuary, San Rafael.

The family prefers that tributes be contributions to the Trinity Lutheran Church building fund.

(By the Rev. Fred C. Braunschweiger, May 27, 1966, at Trinity Lutheran Church, San Rafael, Calif.)

Mrs. Craemer, Jack, members of the Craemer family, and friends in Christ: There is a booklet which Justus Craemer found useful, written by a Walter Williams, founder and dean of the School of Journalism at the University of Missouri since 1908. It is entitled, *The Bible—A Textbook for Journalism.* In the book Williams contends that the Bible gives expression to the fundamental principle of good journalism, the principle of "right selection." We follow William's contention by turning to the Bible, to a text which stands as the motto of the alcove of religion in the reading room of the Congressional Library in Washington.

"He hath showed you O man, what is good, and what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God." Micah 6: 8 (R.S.V.).

It has been my privilege this morning to read some of the tributes that have poured in from all parts of the Country to honor this man. The one thing I noted about them was that they were not the "usual" letters of condolence. They were warm, intimate, and direct carrying within them a sense of deep personal loss. To give one example, the letter written to the members of the California Press Association of which Mr. Craemer was President Emeritus by the current President, Mr. Lowell E. Jessen conveyed this feeling of deep personal loss to me.

This is a loss which I also share. I will miss those telephone calls from Mr. Craemer. They were calls expressing his regret that he could not worship with us on Sunday due to the fact that he would be away from the community on some urgent mission relative to the newspaper business, or State, or affairs of this Country. I will miss conferences in his office at which times we would discuss the best use of his offerings to various churches, charities, and social agencies. Most of all, I will personally miss the encouragement and support that he gave a young pastor beginning thirteen years ago to do his best by the Grace of God. Our friend and brother in Christ had great faith in the youth of our land.

The text from Micah "to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God," epitomized his life.

If this is true, one might ask the question then, why should it be necessary that such a man be called upon to suffer as he did, particularly in the last three years of his life on earth? The answer, if one is to be found, is in a poem entitled "The Weaver" found in his personal file with no indication of the author's name:

"My life is but a weaving
Between my Lord and me,
I cannot choose the colors
He worketh steadily.
Oft times He weaveth sorrow,
And I in foolish pride
Forget He sees the upper,
And I the under side.
Not till the loom is silent
and the shuttles cease to fly
Shall God unroll the canvas
And explain the reason why
The dark threads are as needful
In the weaver's skillful hand
As the threads of gold and silver
In the pattern He has planned."

Mr. Craemer knew this God and had faith in Him. He agreed with Walter Williams in the booklet mentioned earlier that to have no faith "is high treason." And furthermore, that "no man can give his best for mere material considerations." Because of this kind of philosophy of life that our brother in Christ sacrificed much of himself and by the same token, his wife and the members of his family sacrificed much. But this was his decision to be a real, vital person on earth, to become what God has called us all to be.

But what of him now? This question doesn't bother me. I am reminded of a desert scape which hung in his office. The focal point in the picture was a cross constructed of two pieces of driftwood. His faith was in the Christ Who is symbolized in that Cross and his thoughts could best be expressed in the well-loved hymn by Charlotte Elliott:

"Just as I am without one plea
But that Thy blood was shed for me
And that Thou bid'st me come to Thee,
O Lamb of God, I come, I come."

In his personal file Mr. Craemer had several copies of an Easter editorial entitled "Empty Tombs" which first appeared in the Los Angeles Times written by W. Kee Maxwell. I have taken the liberty to glean from this editorial several paragraphs which he himself specifically marked. "How much does the grave hold of those we have known and loved? How much of the individual consists of flesh and bone? What part of this friend and that loved one is mere chemical combinations of so many elements?

Does the grave hold the love they gave us? Does a little earthen mound contain all the gentle actions and kindly words we knew? Does the summer grass hide from our inner vision the worth and courage and sweetness and generosity that warmed our souls to admiration and affection?

To all the broken-hearted and bereft of all time the message of the first Easter morning repeats itself with undiminished assurance: "He is not here." The loved and the lost are not hidden from those who mourn by the closing of the sod above the casket. All that was good and true and beautiful within them persists in the hearts which held them dear, in the deeds they wrought and the cheer they gave and the words they spoke and the songs they sang and the sympathy they gave and the love they bestowed. "He is not here." Only the dust returns to dust. "For life is ever lord of death, and love can never lose its own."

The compelling question today is not "what of him?" but rather what of us? There will appear in the Saturday, May 28 issue of the Independent-Journal published here in Marin County an editorial by Mr. Craemer's son Jack. It may well be the most difficult editorial he will ever have to write. In conclusion the editorial laments the fact "that they aren't making any more like him." This with reference to Justus F. Craemer.

All I can say is that if they aren't making any more like him, then our Country is in great trouble. We may deplore our spiritual and moral plight, but unless by God's grace we adopt the platform suggested by Micah and required by God to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with God, we will remain in great trouble. Perhaps some of you reget the fact that you did not take occasion during Mr. Craemer's life time to express to him your feelings of deep respect and admiration. There is still time however, to resolve under God to take up the cause of justice, kindness, and humility in the presence of God. This is the greatest tribute you could pay to a great and principled man.

Justus was a great admirer of St. Paul. Perhaps he shared the opinion of Walter Williams who called St. Paul "the best correspondent and editorial writer." I can hear our brother even now saying with St. Paul, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith." And I can hear the Savior say to him, "Well done, good and faithful servant; you have been faithful over a little, I will set you over much; enter into the joy of your Master." I'm sure that this will come as a surprise to Justus as he asks, When? When was I faithful? When did I see Thee hungry and feed Thee, or thirsty and give Thee drink? And when did I see Thee a stranger and welcomed Thee and naked and and clothed Thee? And when did I see Thee sick or in prison and visit Thee? And the Lord immediately replies, "as you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it to Me." Matthew 25, 40 (R.S.V.).

Today we will hear our friend and brother Justus bring this sermon to its conclusion. The words, his words, were first written as a tribute to his newspaper associate, Bill Hart, who died in 1942. Justus' editorial published in the Orange Daily News on December 16th of that year concluded with this statement, "Our parting is as simple as he would have it. Well done, thou good and faithful servant. You have served well. We shall never forget you. God bless you and goodbye 'til the morrow'."

Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, more than 14,100 of my constituents participated in the public opinion poll which I recently conducted. I have conducted such polls by mail during each of my five terms in Congress. The 1966 questionnaire was sent to all of the 146,500 mailing addresses in the 10th Congressional District.

Four of the seven questions asked in the 1966 poll concerned the war in Vietnam. Sixty-eight percent of those who participated in the poll answered "No" to the question, "Should we withdraw all of our Armed Forces, regardless of negotiations?" while 17.8 percent replied in the affirmative, and 14.2 percent were undecided.

To the question, "Should we continue to fight a limited war, not so much with the idea of winning, but to convince the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese that they cannot win?" 16.8 percent answered "Yes," 61.9 percent "No," and 21.3 percent were undecided.

The third question on Vietnam was, "Should we cease all air attacks and call for peace negotiations, the participants to include the United States, South Vietnam, North Vietnam, the Vietcong, and the National Liberation Front?" The responses were: 20.7 percent "Yes," 60.7 percent "No," and 18.6 percent undecided.

To the final question in the Vietnam category, "Should we accelerate bombing, mine the Haiphong harbor, and cut enemy supply lines with the designed purpose of achieving victory?" 66.6 percent said "Yes," 20 percent "No," and 13.3 percent were undecided.

The three remaining questions concerned inflation. Obvious dissatisfaction with huge domestic spending programs was evident, as 72.3 percent voted "Yes" when asked, "Should we curtail spending on domestic programs in order to help meet the costs of defense and war?" "No" replies were given by 19.1 percent and 8.6 percent were undecided.

My constituents, for the most part, do not want their taxes increased, as only 8.2 percent of them gave an affirmative response to the question, "Should we increase taxes so that we can, at the same time, fight the war in Vietnam and carry out the domestic programs of the Great Society?" "No" replies were given by 75.4 percent with 16.4 percent undecided.

The final question in the poll, "Should we impose governmental controls on both prices and wages in order to avoid further inflation?" drew 31.1 percent affirmative votes, 55.2 percent negative, and 13.7 percent undecided.

A complete tabulation of the results of my poll follows:

	Yes		No		Undecided	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
VIETNAM						
Should we withdraw all of our armed forces, regardless of negotiations?	2,519	17.8	9,620	68.0	2,007	14.2
Should we continue to fight a limited war, not so much with the idea of winning, but to convince the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese that they cannot win?	2,372	16.8	8,763	61.9	3,011	21.3
Should we cease all air attacks and call for peace negotiations, the participants to include the United States, South Vietnam, North Vietnam, the Vietcong, and the National Liberation Front?	2,935	20.7	8,582	60.7	2,629	18.6
Should we accelerate bombing, mine the Haiphong harbor, and cut enemy supply lines with the designed purpose of achieving victory?	9,427	66.6	2,831	20.0	1,888	13.3
INFLATION						
Should we curtail spending on domestic programs in order to help meet the costs of defense and war?	10,226	72.3	2,704	19.1	1,216	8.6
Should we increase taxes so that we can, at the same time, fight the war in Vietnam and carry out the domestic programs of the Great Society?	1,160	8.2	10,667	75.4	2,319	16.4
Should we impose governmental controls on both prices and wages in order to avoid further inflation?	4,402	31.1	7,804	55.2	1,940	13.7

Fort Walton Beach in Top 10 of Florida's Pace Setter Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the July 22 issue of the Playground Daily News, published in Fort Walton Beach, Fla., calls attention in graphic form to the fact that Fort Walton Beach has been listed among the 10 "pace setter" Florida cities which have experienced the fastest and soundest growth in recent years. Fort Walton Beach is the only city in northwest Florida included in the top 10 list, and by gaining this distinction, the miracle city of the miracle strip continues to show dramatic progress. I am proud to salute Fort Walton Beach and to submit for reprint in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Playground Daily News item:

FORT WALTON BEACH IN TOP 10 OF FLORIDA'S PACE SETTER CITIES

The First Research Corporation of Miami has named Fort Walton Beach in its list of 10 "pace-setter" Florida cities which have experienced the fastest and soundest growth in recent years.

In "Management Letter," the Research organization says the city has grown from a 1960 population of 12,147 to a current figure near 18,600. The city has grown at a rate of 1,200 persons a year. Retail sales increased 160 percent in the 1958–63 period, and nearby Eglin AFB and a booming tourist economy are pushing the city's growth rate upward the researchers said.

'Watch for further population increases, additional tourist oriented facilities and more retail outlets," the resume continues.

Fort Walton Beach is the only city in northwest Florida included in the top 10.

Others are Fort Lauderdale, Titusville, Naples, Pompano Beach, Hollywood, Gainesville, Boca Raton, Winter Park and Plantation.

The Research corporation explains its choice by citing a concept they call "quality that indicate rapid, but sound, community growth."

The researchers indicated that the concept of quality growth was first applied in California, where the response was so gratifying that it was decided to expand the service to Florida. The next analysis of this type will be in the north-east.

"Florida in the 60s entered another 'boom' period," the researchers reported, "but not the boom or bust land speculations of the 20s. Capitalizing on the rapid population growth of the 50s, growth," meaning unusually high levels of construction, population growth, income increases, retail activity, value of housing, industrial expansion—these and many other factors expanding manufacturing activities a major share in the nation's space program and a year round tourist flow, the State's economy is "healthier and better balanced than at any time in its history."

The top 10 cities in Florida, the Corporation says, have "set the pace for others to follow."

"We predict that each of the 10 cities will maintain a very high growth rate," Philip W. Moore, chairman of the board, said. "These cities will continue to set the trend."

First Research Corporation is a publicly-held economic and market research firm that has been in operation since 1950. The firm is engaged in 3 basic fields of research: economic, marketing and financial, and has completed approximately 3,000 studies in these fields. The firm's home office is in Miami, but other offices are staffed in New York and San Francisco and a field interviewing staff covers 48 states and 800 cities, Canada and 10 Caribbean and Latin American countries.

Puerto Rican-American Citizenship Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, our fellow citizens of Puerto Rican origin date their affiliation with us back to 1917.

We have just celebrated an anniversary of the passage of the Jones Act by the Congress of the United States.

Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York has proclaimed the day and I am attaching his proclamation:

PROCLAMATION

The Luis Munoz Rivera Memorial Association informs me that our neighbors of Puerto Rican origin are about to celebrate the granting of American citizenship to Puerto Ricans by the Congress of the United States through the Jones Act of 1917. This is a highly appropriate commemoration.

It behooves us to show our sympathy with the desire of the Puerto Rican community to re-affirm its faith in and love for the country which has done so much to improve the lives of Puerto Ricans here and in the island of their origin.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim Sunday, July 17, 1966, as "Puerto Rican-American Citizenship Day" in New York State.

Given under my hand and the Privy Seal of the State at the Capitol in the City of Albany this 28th day of June in the year of our Lord 1966.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, before World War II had even ended, the Soviet Union according to its plan for world domination began its tyrannical takeover of the nations of Eastern Europe. Czechoslavakia lost its independence in 1939. Swiftly, taking the Western democracies by surprise, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Albania, Bulgaria, and Rumania were subjugated to the Communist onslaught.

These nations and East Germany which the Russians have never released from bondage following their defeat, comprise close to 100 million people. Most of these nations had during the two decades since the First World War enjoyed freedom and independence and were valued members of the community of free nations, although they were in constant fear of the growing threats of nazism and communism.

World War II halted and defeated nazism but left in its wake the confusion which laid the groundwork for the Communist's startling and devastating conquest. These nations joined many others, Armenia and the Ukraine included, who had been crushed and absorbed into the Soviet bloc.

Twenty-one years have passed and these countries remain, under the guise of people's democracies, Soviet satellites exploited for the benefit of the Soviet Union. But the leaders of the free world and the government of this Republic in particular have not forgotten this enslavement of a large part of the world's population. During this week, observed and declared as Captive Nations Week, we renew our resolution to foster the growth and eventual independence of these countries and remain determined to see the freedom of these captive nations.

The Lesson in Indonesia—From the Dublin Courier-Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 1966, that fine newspaper, the Dublin Courier-Herald of Dublin, Ga., made a most cogent statement pertinent to our controversial foreign aid program.

This excellent editorial by this prominent editor of the First District of Georgia entitled "The Lesson in Indonesia," indicates a most perceptive observation of our much-debated foreign aid issue.

The editorial follows:

THE LESSON IN INDONESIA

The situation in Indonesia, now that President Sukarno has all but been completely driven into oblivion, should be studied well and long by the U.S. State Department.

For years this country has poured so-called foreign aid into the country on the pretense of saving it from Communism.

Today in Jakarta one can find a monument to our aid and a country whose economy is tottering.

In the midst of a vast and empty square in the center of Jakarta is a 200 foot high monument, the favorite pet of the ousted President Sukarno. Topping the shaft of the monument is a flaming torch gilded with 66 pounds of gold. The gold leaf on the monument represents a sizeable part of the country's reserves, and the empty square stands as mute evidence of the seventeen useful buildings that were razed to make way for the square in front of the Meredeka Palace where Sukarno lived.

About the square is a seedy city, mute evidence of the economic plight the country is in, thanks to Sukarno and his extravagant regime.

The foreign debt of this Southeast Asian country is a staggering (for them) $2.4 billion. Prices have soared 500 per cent during the past year, and observers say they could soar to 1,000 per cent this year. All kinds of goods are scarce, exports are down and naturally money is short for buying essentials in world trade.

All this despite the millions poured into that country by the U.S.

If we could learn the lesson of Indonesia and profit thereby, a new and candid look would be taken at the aid that we are giving many countries that is being used to promote the personal ego and ambitions of individuals pay for their expensive ways of living, while the masses are made to suffer more and more. We are providing aid in depth as far as dollars are concerned, but the aid benefits for the most part only the top few.

Manuel Diaz, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, all New Yorkers are fortunate that Manuel Diaz, Jr., has been appointed to serve on New York City's new civilian review board. He brings to this important assignment a wealth of experience and complete dedication. I hope that my colleagues will read the following article which Timothy Lee wrote for the New York Post of July 22:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post of July 22, 1966]

REVIEW BOARD MEMBER

(By Timothy Lee)

The only Puerto Rican member of the new civilian review board describes himself as a man of peace, who believes there are reasonable alternatives to violence. He is not a pacifist, he says, nor does he subscribe to the social-action philosophy of passive resistance. But he has on occasion picketed City Hall with members of the poor from the Lower East Side while he was community affairs director at Mobilization for Youth.

The board is an instrument that defends basic human rights of the individual, whether the citizen's or the cop's," said Manuel Diaz, Jr., the 43-year-old executive director of the Puerto Rican Community Development Project, in his second-floor office at 143 W. 72d St. "It is not there merely to uphold every complaint of aggrieved ghetto members."

For a man who believes in peace and reason, Diaz speaks in metaphors of violence. He says he expects to be "shot at from all sides" while a member of the review board. The shots will come from the Patrolmen's Benevolent Assn., he says, if the PBA sees his role as "too aggressive in defending the rights of citizens"; or from the Puerto Rican community if it appears he is "too righteous in defending the right of policemen."

"If you don't want to get shot at then don't get on the firing line," said Diaz, a gray-haired man with an easy smile, "I expect to come out of this with my head bloodied, but I hope unbowed."

Diaz' easy use of the language of violence may come from a life spent in some of the most explosive areas in the city. His parents brought their son, an only child, to East Harlem from Puerto Rico in 1927 when he was 5 years old. His father Manuel, Sr., gave up a small printing business in Humacao to spend 30 years feeding cardboard into a printing machine in a factory in Queens, while his mother, Filomena, worked as a seamstress in the garment district and earned more money than her husband. Both are now retired and live in the Bronx.

He attended public schools here and graduated from Stuyvesant HS in Manhattan. He spent three years in the Army as a private in World War II, and while sleeping outdoors during the winter of 1944–45 in France he contracted a "minimal case" of tuberculosis.

The illness—now considered arrested—interrupted has post-war education in his junior year at City College, where he was majoring in electrical engineering. He spent 1947–48 in a Veterans Hospial and there decided to be a social worker. He returned to City College as a sophomore, and after graduation won his master's from the Columbia University School of Social Work in 1953.

He spent the next seven years at the Union Settlement in East Harlem working with youth gangs. "The frustration of constantly putting out fires," he says, drove him to Plascale, Mexico, where for a year he directed a village aid project with the American Friends Service Committee. He spent two more years working with youth gangs, this time in the East Bronx, before moving to MFY for three years. He left there a year ago to design the Puerto Rican Community Development Project.

While he was at Union Settlement, Diaz hired for the arts and crafts program a minister's daughter named Sharon Daniel. He fired her in less than a month and married her in less than three years. "I guess I just felt sorry for her," he said. They have a daughter, Andrea, 4. Diaz has a second daughter, Lisa, 15, by his first marriage, which ended in divorce.

They live in a five-room $80 apartment on E. Seventh St. between Avenues C and D, a street of tenements and renovated brownstones with rents as high as $240 a month.

"I'm a product of the ghetto who happened to go to college," Diaz said. "I could afford $200 in a luxury building but I prefer to living in a neighborhood with some flavor."

President Praises Administrator McKee of Federal Aviation Agency for Record in Economy, Safety, and Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important and one of the most difficult positions in our Federal Government today is that of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, which deals with a scientific and technical field that is constantly changing and presenting new problems.

It is my feeling that this Nation is fortunate to have as the Administrator of FAA, Gen. William M. McKee, who is doing an excellent job of guiding the FAA as it fulfills its mission and, at the same time, instituting an effective cost reduction program.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, I have some personal knowledge of the

Federal Aviation Agency and the way Administrator McKee is responding to this challenge. I can report that upon our subcommittee's recommendation the full Committee on Appropriations praised the FAA for its improvement in efficiency and economy of operations.

In this connection, President Johnson recently wrote Administrator McKee, emphasizing his record as Administrator and commending him for his good work. I ask unanimous consent that the President's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD because of its interest to my colleagues and to the Nation.

The letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
July 6, 1966.

DEAR BOZO: I have noted with satisfaction the excellent work which you and your associates at the Federal Aviation Agency have been doing in reducing costs and manpower while absorbing additional workload and improving service to the public.

I have taken particular note of your cost reduction program under which you saved $47 million during the 1966 fiscal year. These savings have been accompanied by a reduction in agency employment of more than 3,500 employees—8 percent—since 1963. The Agency has succeeded in combining economy in administration with a safety program which has helped the commercial air carriers of the United States achieve the best safety record in the world and the best record for any 5-year period in the history of American aviation. You have clearly demonstrated that outstanding performance in a critical and complex program can be continually achieved while reducing costs.

I am pleased to observe that the House Appropriations Committee, after thoroughly reviewing your program and budget for the 1967 fiscal year, singled out the Federal Aviation Agency for special commendation for the efficiency and economies achieved in recent years.

As you know, in my budget message for the 1967 fiscal year, I stressed the importance of strengthening the coordination of Federal programs in the field and giving more freedom of action and judgment to the people on the firing line. The FAA has provided an example of what can be done to decentralize management to field officials who have the authority to act promptly and effectively in meeting the needs of the public. Your success in establishing regional and area centers of field supervision while simultaneously reducing employment in field offices has demonstrated that decentralization can mean better public service and more productive use of field personnel.

I shall count on you and the good people at the Federal Aviation Agency to continue to provide examples of public service at its best.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Disabled American Veterans

SPEECH
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the people of this great country have for well over 150 years lived in an environment that has demanded freedom, fostered liberty, and maintained the basic rights of man. Yet many times the very shores of these United States have been ominously threatened by a variety of enemies; and on each occasion American men and women have responded to the call of duty and put their very own lives in jeopardy so that this great country might flourish and maintain its integrity while providing a common security for its citizens.

It is these brave Americans that I now praise before our colleagues, many of whom I know have served this country valiantly, both in the Congress and on the battlefield.

But when war is over, the fighting ended, many servicemen return wounded, disabled, maimed for life; some never return at all, but lie buried in a foreign land with a heartbroken family left at home mourning and without care.

These men, women, and children who directly feel the consequences of war must be cared for, and so I take this opportunity before our colleagues to pay public tribute to an organization that has recognized the necessary responsibility of providing for and advancing the cause of thousands of disabled servicemen, their widows, dependents, and orphans. Such an organization is the congressionally chartered Disabled American Veterans whose national commander is Claude L. Callegary, and which has just recently celebrated 34 years of exemplary service to this country and its fightingmen and families.

As each citizens has an obligation to fight for his country during war, so does that country have the responsibility to aid, protect, rehabilitate, compensate, in all, to serve that person and his family after war. Once again I extend my personal praise and thanks before our colleagues to the DAV for its incalculable, unselfish service.

Billion-Dollar Development

SPEECH
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, today, July 25, I am introducing a bill which I had hoped to introduce last Thursday, July 21.

This bill would authorize Duke Power Co. to build a dam across the Savannah River at Middleton Shoals in Anderson County, S.C., and Elbert County, Ga. This dam will permit Duke to build one of the world's largest steamplants in Anderson County for the generation of electricity.

The bill I am introducing today would also authorize simultaneously a Federal dam at Trotters Shoals in Abbeville County, S.C., and Elbert County, Ga.

I am introducing this legislation today as a result of an agreement reached in my office last week with representatives of Duke Power Co. and the bistate power committee representing rural electric cooperatives in Georgia and North Carolina.

The bistate committee had filed a protest with the Federal Power Commission to prevent Duke from proceeding with the construction of still another huge Duke project upstream on the tributaries of the Savannah River at Keowee-Toxaway in Oconee and Pickens Counties in my congressional district. Duke made application for a license from the Federal Power Commission on January 4, 1965, to begin the Keowee-Toxaway project. Only a few days ago Duke announced plans to build a $207 million nuclear power generating plant at Keowee-Toxaway in addition to the two hydro units already announced.

The bistate power committee, representing rural electric cooperatives, feared that the public power project at Trotters Shoals would never be authorized and built if Duke were granted a license to construct Keowee-Toxaway. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I agreed to support and introduce legislation calling for both Trotters Shoals and Middleton Shoals. The bistate committee agreed to withdraw their objections to Duke's application for a license to begin Keowee-Toxaway.

This morning the Bi-State committee withdrew its objections to Duke's Keowee-Toxaway project in Oconee and Pickens Counties before the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. Speaker, Duke has previously announced that its total investment in the Keowee-Toxaway project would eventually cost over $700 million. Duke's Middleton Shoals project would cost over $200 million. The Government dam at Trotters Shoals would cost approximately $85 million. All of these projects are compatible as now proposed.

Mr. Speaker, Mead Paper Co. owned a pulp and paper mill site on the Savannah River at Calhoun Falls which would be flooded by Trotters Shoals. In working out the present compromise arrangement, I suggested to Mead the purchase of another site above the level of the Trotters Shoals Reservoir where Mead could build with or without Trotters Shoals. Mead did so and subsequently approved of this compromise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the way is clear for the expenditure of more than $1,050 million in my congressional district. Almost all of these developments will be in counties designated as a part of Appalachia. This huge expenditure will equal the entire amount authorized by Congress for the development of the Appalachian Region.

This fair agreement reached with Duke, Bi-State, Mead, and all concerned will insure job opportunity for our people, taxes for our schools, and progress for generations to come. This gigantic development will mean cheap electricity for the people of Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina. It will mean for the cities of Charlotte, Greenville, Spartanburg, Anderson, Greenwood, and many others cheap electricity and a continuation of their dynamic growth. This development will mean huge revenues for the Federal, State, and local treasuries—

Duke will pay into the Federal, South Carolina, and local treasuries approximately $44 million annually in taxes on the Keowee-Toxaway project alone when completed. This compromise is a positive alternative to stalemate, negativism, and retrogression on the Savannah. It will signal the dawn of a new era.

Heroism in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, a number of men from my State of Wyoming have lost their lives while serving their country in Vietnam. While we are saddened by their deaths, we are heartened by the courage and professional diligence with which they pursue our objectives in that country.

Preceding the list of all Wyoming casualties in Vietnam was Capt. Carlton J. Holland, Jr., who was killed in action in Duc Phong about February 9, 1965. For his great courage in protecting a small group of tribesmen, who stayed with him to the bitter end, Captain Holland was awarded a posthumous Distinguished Service Cross, and the Silver Star for gallantry in action went to three servicemen who perished with him.

A recent article by Jim Hicks, in the Buffalo, Wyo., Bulletin, describes another heroic effort by a Wyoming citizen, 1st Lt. Bill Ahern, of Johnson County, Wyo. A graduate of the University of Wyoming, 1st Lieutenant Ahern has just returned from Vietnam after winning a Purple Heart with two Oak-Leaf clusters, a Bronze Star, and the Silver Star. His action is described in the article and provides an inspiration to all of us by bringing home the realization that our fighting men are succeeding in a new type of war, and kind of warfare that some people once said Americans were incapable of fighting.

The important thing is that our fighting men are not discouraged about the course of the war and they deserve all the support we can give them. As the article points out:

> The worst thing that could happen would be for the American people to lose heart or become discouraged.

The actions of the late Captain Holland and of 1st Lieutenant Ahern are a source of pride for their State and Nation. Under unanimous consent I place this excellent story in the RECORD, to further publicize the gallant actions of our soldiers and to share a firsthand account of the experience of fighting in Vietnam, which was felt by both of these dedicated Wyoming men:

[From the Buffalo (Wyo.) Bulletin, July 7, 1966]

RETURNING SOLDIER GIVES VIEW OF LIFE, FIGHTING IN VIETNAM

(By Jim Hicks)

At the present time there are several young men from Johnson county who are serving with the armed forces in Vietnam, and it appears that many others will be fighting there in the future.

While here in Johnson county we worry about moisture conditions, the volume of tourist travel or the possibilities of industrial development, the young men in Vietnam must be concerned with the number of rounds of ammunition they have in their pack or whether or not a Viet Cong sniper is nearby.

A clear picture of the situation faced by the soldier in Vietnam was given recently by First Lt. Bill Ahern who came home after about a year.

Lt. Ahern, who graduated from JCHS and the University of Wyoming, took a commission in the U.S. Army through the ROTC program at the university. He went on active duty in August of 1964 and in June of 1965 he was on his way to Viet Nam.

In the more than 300 days he spent in that hot moist land, Lt. Ahern saw what freedom really costs. A Purple Heart with two Oak-Leaf clusters, a Bronze Star and the Silver Star awarded to him would indicate that he made a sizeable contribution to this freedom that we all enjoy.

On May 11 of this year, by direction of the President of the United States, Lt. Ahern was awarded the Silver Star.

The award was given as a result of his actions during a battle in Vietnam on Feb. 1, 1966.

The reason for the award, according to the general orders accompanying it was—

"For gallantry in action: First Lieutenant Ahern distinguished himself on 1 February 1966 while serving as platoon leader of a unit on a search and destroy operation in a village in the Nohn Trach District, Republic of Vietnam.

"As First Lt. Ahern's company moved through the outskirts of the village, intense small arms and automatic weapons fire was received from fortified Viet Cong bunkers.

"First Lt. Ahern rapidly and aggressively maneuvered his platoon to a position from which they could engage the bunker.

"Aided by a tank, he and his platoon assaulted and destroyed the Viet Cong position. When it became apparent that the Viet Cong bunker complex was far more extensive than originally estimated, First Lt. Ahern's company was repositioned to allow air artillery strikes. When the company assaulted the bunker complex the second time, numerous mines and grenades were detonated, and a large number of men were wounded, including the company commander, company first sergeant, and all company officers.

"Although wounded, First Lt. Ahern immediately assumed command of the company and moved through the battle zone which was still under intense fire, and insured that all casualties were evacuated. First Lt. Ahern, following the evacuation of the wounded, effectively reorganized the company and redeployed it for another assault against the Viet Cong positions.

"First Lt. Ahern's unimpeachable valor in close combat was in keeping with the highest traditions of the military services and reflects great credit upon himself, his unit and the United States Army."

When Lt. Ahern first arrived in Vietnam his unit was located in Vung Tau, in the southern part of the delta region. They were flown into Bien Hoa about 25 miles east-northeast of Saigon.

They set up a base camp about six miles to the southeast. The first action for Ahern came on July 19 when his platoon, which is made up of about 46 men, ran into a machine gun position.

This was the start of something big, because the battalion had to fight for five days and nights to hold onto their position.

The Viet Cong apparently know when a new unit takes to the field, and it is common for them to hit the new unit hard in hopes of causing them to break and run. Ahern said the company's casualties were described as light in the engagement. U.S. artillery knocked out six Viet Cong mortar positions during the battle, using a new radar system to determine the coordinates of the mortar positions by picking up the mortar shells being fired on the radar.

Since the use of the radar system, Ahern said, the VC's fire a few mortar rounds and then run from that location if they are within the range of the U.S. artillery.

In August the unit moved to the Pleiku area where they would set up night ambushes for the Viet Cong every other night.

One night which was especially dark, Lt. Ahern and his men heard something which sounded like a good sized unit moving into their ambush.

Suddently the men opened up with intense fire which was sustained for several minutes. The fire was not returned, but when they stopped shooting they could hear heavy breathing in the jungle area. Again they opened fire, and finally all was quiet. With the dawn came the surprise that the platoon had moved down three cows.

During this period of ambushes the soldiers also killed three Viet Cong.

"We never use a trail or road when we were moving around over there," Ahern said, "because you can get ambushed that way."

Each soldier in Viet Nam carries from 300 to 500 rounds of ammunition for the new M16 rifles. They also carry about three grenades, and each platoon will also be carrying a mine or two and a light anti-tank weapon. In addition to this the foot soldier in Viet Nam also carries all his other needs including food.

Once, while Lt. Ahern's unit was being used for strategic defense of a Vietnamese unit, the Viet Cong forced the citizens of a nearby village to go out in front of the American positions at night in hopes that the U.S. troops would open fire and give the Viet Cong ammunition for their propaganda machine.

The U.S. troops got word of what was going on in time, and sent a patrol out and the Viet Cong pulled back, allowing the villagers to return to their homes.

When the units, such as that of Lt. Ahern's, are out on patrol, they from time to time discover base camps of the Viet Cong. These camps, though well fortified with trenches and bunkers, are usually impossible to see from the air. More than once the Viet Cong would flee just ahead of the advancing U.S. troops and the soldiers would find food boiling on the stoves of the camps.

If such a camp is located, it is marked for destruction by artillery and bombing.

Lt. Ahern described the war as not being a battle for real estate, but more a test of mobility of force aimed at destroying the enemy.

Not too long before Lt. Ahern came back to the states the company he was with captured 570 tons of rice, 68 weapons and a large number of bicycles. This was near the Cambodian border.

He said the morale of the U.S. forces seems to be very good, and as far as Lt. Ahern is concerned, the American foot soldier of 1966 is well trained and is intelligent and courageous.

He said that the demonstration against the war in Viet Nam did little to discourage the troops, and most soldiers receive a large supply of mail from the states.

"One man in my platoon got 97 cards and letters in one day before Christmas," Lt. Ahern said. "He was busy reading every time we stopped to take a break."

But even with the red ants, leeches and Viet Cong, the U.S. soldier in Viet Nam seems to realize the meaning of his efforts there.

Lt. Ahern will probably now be stationed in the south where he will train officers who will fight in Viet Nam. He has the experience for that job.

The young men from this area who are in the Vietnam area now are appreciated and are worthy of the thoughts of those of us at home. War is very real in Vietnam, and it would appear that many young men from this area will face this prospect in the future.

Lt. Ahern said he feels that he can see an end to the fighting there, but it will probably be a long way off. The only way to victory appears to be the long hard way and the worst thing that could happen would be for the American public to lose heart or become discouraged.

To date only one Johnson county man has been killed in Vietnam. Ernest Taylor of Sussex was killed on Nov. 17, 1965.

It would appear that the war in Vietnam has and is turning more in the favor of freedom, and the only question that really remains is whether or not this country is doing enough.

Extensive Small Business Committee Hearings Point to Improved Programs and Policies of the Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the House Small Business Committee last week completed an extensive review of the programs and policies of the Small Business Administration.

It is my belief that this constructive and beneficial examination of all phases of SBA operations will assist the Agency in serving the American small businessman in a challenging year of change.

In this connection, my least weekly newsletter, Capitol Comments, gives a summary and review of the week's hearings. I ask unanimous consent that this report be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON SBA IDENTIFY PROBLEMS, POINT TO IMPROVED POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

(By JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee)

The full review of programs and policies of the Small Business Administration just completed by the House Small Business Committee was, in my view, a constructive and beneficial examination that will help to improve SBA operations in a challenging year of change. During the week, the Small Business Committee—which I serve as Chairman—heard testimony by officials of SBA, representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and other executive agencies, by officers and directors of small business associations and by small businessmen themselves. A formal Committee report with detailed recommendations will be made at a later date.

With SBA's status established as an independent agency reporting only to the President and the Congress—with a newly appointed Administrator, Bernard Boutin—and with new financing legislation recently enacted into law, testimony indicated that as Fiscal Year 1967 gets underway the agency is doing a competent job in administering the various programs of assistance to small business. These programs include the regular business loan program, the community development loan program (502), the procurement and management assistance program and other services.

Committee testimony developed that there are two problem areas—the Small Business Investment Company program, established to provide long term equity capital to small businesses (SBIC), and the Economic Opportunity Program (OEO), the latter enacted as part of the Anti-Poverty Program. SBA Administrator Boutin said steps were being taken to establish new standards and new rules to put the SBIC program on a sounder and more efficient basis. He also promised to explore every avenue of improvement to assure a broader application of the Economic Opportunity loan program which is currently operating only in urban areas.

As Chairman of the Committee, it is my position that officials of SBA and the Office of Economic Opportunity should comply with the law which requires "equitable distribution" between urban and rural areas, now denied this assistance. Other questions raised by the Committee included the desirability of ceilings on loans below those set by the Congress by statute and the fairness of a system of administrative priorities. It is may belief that SBA loan programs should operate on the basis prescribed by the Congress and that each loan application should stand on its own merits without reference to arbitrary administrative priorities.

Testimony indicated that SBA is changing with the times and endeavoring to put into effect a "team concept" that will focus all of its resources—financial, management assistance, government contract guidance, and other programs—on the problems of a small business at a time when such assistance is needed. Witness after witness testified that the objectives and and purposes of SBA programs are laudable and worthwhile. Helpful new legislation has recently been enacted into law and the future of SBA appears both bright and promising. It is the hope of our Small Business Committee that the suggestions and recommendations made will assist in a more effective use of appropriated funds and programs for American Small Businessmen.

Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the responses of nearly 15,000 residents of California's Seventh Congressional District make up the results of my 1966 questionnaire.

I enclose the results of this annual legislative poll for the information and attention of our colleagues:

CONGRESSMAN JEFFERY COHELAN'S 1966 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE POLL

[Results in percent]

1. Vietnam: Recognizing that no short statement can fully convey your views, which of the following most nearly expresses your opinion on the war in Vietnam?

(a) We should blockade ports, increase bombing and take any other steps necessary to achieve military victory	18.7
(b) We should increase U.S. ground troops to whatever size is necessary to clear South Vietnam of Communist forces	7.1
(c) I believe the President's policy of military resistance and efforts to achieve negotiations is about right	13.1
(d) We should continue our military resistance but publicly state our willingness to negotiate with all parties, including the Viet Cong, and to undertake a mutual deescalation of the war	25.9
(e) The war in Vietnam is wrong and we should pull out now	32.3

2. Civil rights: Several proposals to guarantee civil rights have been introduced in Congress. Would you favor the following:

(a) Establishing requirements for nondiscriminatory jury selection in Federal and State courts?

Yes	72.6
No	13.4
Undecided	14.0

(b) Strengthening the authority of Federal courts to try those who murder, attack or intimidate civil rights workers?

Yes	68.7
No	19.2
Undecided	12.1

(c) Prohibiting discrimination in the sale or rental of housing?

Yes	50.3
No	35.8
Undecided	13.9

3. War on poverty: Congress has been asked to increase the funding for the 2-year-old war on poverty from $1.5 to $1.75 billion.

(a) Should the war on poverty be increased?

Yes	35.2
No	37.5
Undecided	29.3

(b) Should it be cut back?

Yes	32.8
No	29.3
Undecided	37.9

(c) Should it be held at its present level?

Yes	21.8
No	33.5
Undecided	44.7

4. Rent supplements: Last year Congress authorized, but did not provide funds for, a program of rent supplements to help low-income families, who are eligible for public housing, afford decent private housing. Should Congress provide funds for this program?

Yes	40.6
No	44.9
Undecided	14.5

5. National Teachers Corps: In 1965 Congress also approved, but did not fund, a National Teachers Corps to provide local education agencies, in areas having high concentration of low-income families, with experienced teachers for two years. Should Congress finance this program?

Yes	63.9
No	26.2
Undecided	9.9

6. Minimum wage: As this questionnaire is being prepared, legislation to increase the minimum wage from $1.25 to $1.60 an hour and to extend its coverage to laundry, dry cleaning, hotel-motel, additional retail trade employees, and workers on large farms is being considered.

(a) Do you favor increasing the minimum wage?

Yes	57.2
No	32.0
Undecided	10.8

(b) Do you favor extending its coverage?

Yes	69.5
No	18.5
Undecided	12.0

7. Unemployment compensation: Legislation has been proposed to amend the Federal-State unemployment insurance system by establishing minimum State standards (California already is at or near the top in most standards) and to extend its coverage to 4.5 million of the 15 million workers not presently covered.

(a) Would you favor establishing minimum state standards for amount, duration and eligibility of benefits?

Yes	59.8
No	21.6
Undecided	18.6

(b) Would you favor extending its coverage, as proposed, to employees of small firms, non-profit organizations, workers on large farms and driver-salesmen?

Yes	57.3
No	23.9
Undecided	18.8

8. Consumer protection: For several years bills have been before Congress to insure truth in lending (require money lenders to provide borrowers with full disclosure of finance charges) and truth in packaging (prohibit misleading or deceptive packaging and labeling). Do you feel there is a need for:

(a) A truth-in-lending bill?

Yes	89.5
No	4.7
Undecided	5.8

(b) A truth-in-packaging bill?

Yes	87.5
No	6.1
Undecided	6.4

9. Highway safety: Last year's highway toll was 49,000 deaths and 3 million injuries. Legislation giving the Secretary of Commerce authority to determine the adequacy of safety features in new cars has been introduced. Would you support this legislation?

Yes	74.6
No	15.8
Undecided	9.6

10. Transportation: A proposal has been made to create a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation. It would provide central management for transportation and safety functions now carried on by 11 different bureaus and agencies, but would not affect the regulatory functions of the ICC, CAB, or Maritime Commission. Do you favor this proposal?

Yes	52.2
No	22.1
Undecided	25.7

11. Reapportionment: The Supreme Court has ruled that both houses of a State legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population. This is the "one man, one vote" principle. Do you favor this principle?

Yes	45.4
No	39.1
Undecided	15.5

12. Four-year term: Members of the House of Representatives currently serve a 2-year term. Would you support the proposal, presently being considered, to make this a 4-year term beginning in 1972?

Yes	50.6
No	34.9
Undecided	14.5

13. Intelligence agencies: Congress presently reviews the CIA and other government intelligence agencies by subcommittees of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. A joint congressional committee to provide broader and continuing review has been proposed. Should Congress establish such a committee?

Yes	56.2
No	20.4
Undecided	23.4

14. Economy: if price increases should necessitate some form of economic control in order to prevent inflation, would you favor the following:

(a) Using fiscal and monetary policies (increased taxes and higher interest rates) to slow down spending, investment and inventory build-up?

Yes	37.1
No	30.0
Undecided	32.9

(b) Continuing present pressures for voluntary adherence to wage and price guideposts?

Yes	47.9
No	18.9
Undecided	33.2

(c) Instituting wage and price controls?

Yes	34.4
No	35.2
Undecided	30.4

Water Crisis in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the increasing interest here in Congress, and in the Nation at large, in the vital subject of America's future water supply, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point two excellent articles taken from recent editions of the Los Angeles Times which deal with the present water crisis facing the residents of our Western States:

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 3, 1966]

WATER CRISIS IN CONGRESS

There was considerable rejoicing when H.R. 4671—the legislation to solve western water shortages—finally emerged from prolonged hearings before a House Interior subcommittee.

The cheers, however, could be highly premature.

Recent developments may, in fact, force California into a complete re-examination of the way in which the water interests of the West are being manhandled in Washington.

At the time of its introduction, the bill offered the best hope yet that the seven states of the Colorado River Basin would have the water absolutely essential to their future growth. As such, it was of the utmost importance to this state and particularly to semi-arid Southern California.

This proposed legislation was based upon an historic agreement among all the basin states to support a water development plan. Quarrels of the past were forgotten as each recognized that individual water problems could be best resolved by united action.

Provision was made for construction of projects in Arizona and the Upper Basin states, but the most important feature of the bill was authorization of a study that could lead to importing new water to supplement the meager flow of the Colorado River.

Although it is eminently clear that the Colorado cannot possibly support the future needs of the basin states, the bill ran into determined opposition at once in the subcommittee.

Most of the public controversy arose over the fears of some conservationists that the proposed Marble Canyon and Hualapai (Bridge Canyon) Dams would "ruin" Grand Canyon National Park. The far more ominous moves, however, were those by members of Congress from the Pacific Northwest, who oppose any study that could result in giving up even a small part of the vast surplus of the Columbia River.

The combined pressure was apparently so great that last week Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, an early supporter of the bill, proposed that it be emasculated by not only eliminating the provision for Hualapai Dam but also deleting any reference to an importation study.

By so doing, the secretary would leave little more than a title and a number on a once highly promising bill.

As he well knows, there simply is not enough water in the Colorado for even the near future. To approve new projects without any provision for new water would be legislative folly.

There is already talk in the Upper Basin states of withdrawal from the basin agreement if importation studies do not start promptly. Similarly, California must carefully examine the course of water legislation to determine if it can continue to support the one-sided compromises.

We can draw little or no encouragement from the National Water Commission legislation recently passed by the Senate. Authored by the able Senator HENRY JACKSON, Democrat of Washington, principal "defender" of the Columbia River, this bill would institute a nationwide study of water problems with no assurance of any priority for the urgent and unique dilemma of the West.

The eastern seaboard has indeed suffered serious drought conditions, but the reasons—lack of meters, antiquated reservoirs, polluted rivers—are very different from the factors in the Pacific Southwest shortage. The problems should be studied concurrently but separately.

Neither California nor any other Colorado River Basin state would take Columbia water that is needed now or ever by the Pacific Northwest.

Any impartial survey, however, would show that a small portion of the 170 million acre-feet of water dumped annually by the Columbia into the sea could be diverted to the Colorado without harm.

Inter-state rivers are a national resource. Congress has the obligation to make certain that one area of the nation is not deprived of essential water while another wastes it.

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 7, 1966]

FACING THE ISSUE: WATER AND THE WEST

Water was essential to the development of the West, and it is indispensable to the regon's future growth. The problems of water planning are discussed by U.S. Reclamation Commissioner Floyd Dominy in an interview with William Thorson of the Times Editorial Board.

Question. Mr. Dominy, some conservationists claim that the proposed Hualapai (Bridge Canyon) and Marble Canyon Dams will destroy the Grand Canyon. Do you and the Bureau of Reclamation agree?

Answer. No, we emphatically disagree. As a matter of fact I'm afraid that some of these groups are deliberately hoping that everybody will think they're talking about destroying Grand Canyon National Park.

Actually neither of these dams is in National Park, and neither of the reservoirs is in the park except that the reservoir behind Bridge Canyon will occupy the river for 13 miles at the very northwestern corner of the national park, where the river is the boundary of the park. The flow of water through the park will not be changed by reason of either of these dams, except that it will be a trout-water stream instead of a muddy Colorado River. I don't believe that change is bad.

Question. Will either the dams or the reservoirs be visible from any of the public observation points within the national park?

Answer. No! Emphatically not! Marble Canyon Dam is 12.5 miles upstream of the northernmost boundary of the park.

Hualapai Dam is clear down at the head waters of Lake Mead. Waters of its reservoir only reach into the very remote corner of the park where there are no vista points, no roads, and no access.

Question. Will there be any change in the river itself as it flows through the Grand Canyon National Park?

Answer. Not any further change with Marble Canyon Dam than has already occurred with Glen Canyon Dam.

Now that we have regulated the river no longer will there be high-flood flows and no longer will there be little, low-trickle flows in the dry years. And of course the river will be colder and will be cleaner and will be trout water.

Question. Are the dams necessary to the proposed Central Arizona Project legislation?

Answer. Marble Canyon Dam is considered necessary to finance the Central Arizona Project and to provide pumping power at a cheaper rate than would otherwise by available, thereby making the project feasible.

Hualapai Dam would not be necessary to finance the Central Arizona Project but would be necessary to augment the Lower Basin fund if we're going to add to the water supply in the Colorado River which is necessary for the continued growth and development of the Southwest.

Question. Is the Columbia River a feasible supplementary source of water for the Pacific Southwest?

Answer. No study of any real significance or depth has ever been made. There is, however, opinion by many people that the Columbia River might be a source of water above the needs of the Pacific Northwest. Therefore a study ought to be made to see whether it would be feasible, first assuming that there is actual surplus above the ultimate, full requirements in the Pacific Northwest to move some of that water down to the dry Southwest.

Question. How long would such a study require?

Answer. Well it's our judgment that a study of this magnitude could not be done short of about a three-year period as a minimum. Possibly it would take a little longer.

Question. If the legislation were passed this year, then could such a study be completed by, say, 1970?

Answer. I think it would be physically possible to complete it by 1970.

Question. Can sea water desalinization make a substantial dent in water shortages now or in the foreseeable future?

Answer. A number of processes have proven physically practicable. It's the economics that determine, of course, the magnitude of desalinization in the future.

I personally don't see any possibility in the next several decades that we could hope that desalinization would be cheap enough to provide water for irrigation. I would think that it is already cheap enough in many instances to augment the growing needs of a municipality but not to fully supply the municipality.

Question. Could desalinization ever be considered as a substitute for inter-basin importation of water for the Colorado?

Answer. I don't think one should be considered a substitute for the other. I think both should be studied and a determination made as to which is the more practical and perhaps you need both to solve the problem ultimately.

Question. Do you consider the 160-acre limitation on farms served by reclamation projects to be outmoded in certain agricultural areas?

Answer. As an economist and as a farmer I'm very cognizant of the agricultural revolution that is and has taken place starting with World War II.

Farming as a way of life is entirely different now than it was pre-World War II. And I think that the federal reclamation law has failed to keep pace with the change in the business of agriculture.

Now that doesn't mean that I think the principle of federal assistance to irrigation to be spread as widely as economically feasible ought to be abandoned.

But I do think we ought to take a good look at the 160-acre per individual-ownership limitation in the light of agriculture in today's economic climate.

Question. What is the current Interior Department attitude on the Imperial Irrigation District?

Answer. The solicitors of the Department of Interior ruled a year ago last December that the 160-acre limitation of federal reclamation law does in fact apply to the Imperial Irrigation District although there had been a long history of actions to the contrary. The Imperial District has filed a brief objecting to that ruling and it's my understanding that Interior and Justice Department attorneys have advised that this brief does not change the solicitor's opinion. But the department is very willing to cooperate in a court test and to have this settled once and for all.

Question. Is a change in policy likely in the Imperial matter or in the overall 160-acre limitation in the Reclamation Law?

Answer. The Congress, a year or two ago, asked the Secretary of Interior to prepare information on the current status of excess land on our projects and to recommend any changes that he thought ought to be undertaken or considered by Congress.

That report is in its final stages. It will show that for the most part excess land law is being complied with on reclamation projects with very minor exceptions.

It will also suggest some new policies and suggest to Congress that it might be time to take a new look at this whole problem in the light of a great change in the business of agriculture.

Confident Uncertainty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, D. W. Brosnan, president of the great Southern Railway System, is a dynamic, imaginative, forthright leader in the world of transportation and industry. He thrives on competition and is confident in the future of our Nation.

Bill Brosnan firmly believes that the United States is on the dawn of the greatest era in our history if we only continue to move forward with our private enterprise system which made America the envy of the world.

Mr. Brosnan, on June 5, delivered an outstanding commencement address at Mercer University in Macon, Ga. I commend Mr. Brosnan's superb address to the attention of the Congress and to the people of our country:

CONFIDENT UNCERTAINTY

(An address by D. W. Brosnan, President, Southern Railway System, on commencement day, Mercer University, Macon, Ga., June 5, 1966)

True leadership is undertaken only by the confidently uncertain who recognize that the onward course of individual and of community benefit depends upon people who dare to test what they are and what they know in order to accomplish worthwhile ends.

* * * * *

. . . a genuine idealism based on a desire to be useful to others . . . to contribute to social betterment . . . and to advance the welfare of people . . . does not require the surrender of personal initiative or the abandonment of time-proven ways in the conduct of our nation's affairs.

* * * * *

Desire and a confident uncertainty can combine to make each of you worthy opponents for the most challenging tests life can hold for you. They will make you seek out opportunities to add to the accumulated store of national character that identifies the American people. They will assure that you maintain your identity as an individual—a useful and a free man or woman. Life will be richer for you and for others as you live it fully.

The assembly here today of parents, relatives and friends of members of this graduating class is a mass congratulation for each of you graduates. This is a day that marks a high point in your lives. And it is a high point, as well, in the lives of the many people who have lent a hand and encouraged you on your roads to this achievement of college graduation. We congratulate you and wish you well through the rest of your lives as you build on the foundations laid here at Mercer.

Even though it is now many years later, I can still recall the confident uncertainty that marked my own feelings on graduation day. Maybe I had better repeat part of that. I called it confident *uncertainty*. A somewhat similar feeling is probably general among members of the classes of 1966, at Mercer and on the other college and university campuses throughout our great country.

I would urge you to maintain this spirit of confident uncertainty throughout your lives. It is the stuff that causes growth. With it you can become ever more useful and contributing members of the society of which you are part.

We have only to look back through the history of this country to see what a vital element confident uncertainty has been in the development of our nation and in the shaping of our character as a people.

From the earliest settlers through the various waves of migration to those of the present day, this great land of ours has held promise for those who were willing to match themselves confidently against a future that could not be fully known.

The men who drafted our constitution and the citizens who ratified their action had a strong belief that this brave new venture in self government was worthy of trial. They felt so despite the absence of proof that men could govern themselves successfully in such a way.

The men and women who pioneered to push our boundaries westward to the Pacific ventured greatly in pitting their known abilities against expected but unclearly defined difficulties. In so doing they often found previously unrecognized reservoirs of strength in their characters that enabled them to do far more than they had expected of themselves.

We could multiply examples of this sort to try to help explain the American character and what we often refer to as the American way of life. In one form or another confident uncertainty has marked the approaches that have led to advance over the whole broad range of experience and activity in the building of our country. It isn't out of date—it never will be—it's as fresh and new as space exploration, which is, in itself, a classic instance of confident uncertainty.

Mercer University stands today as a fine and growing institution whose beginnings are rooted in the confidence of a man that the establishment of a school for the training of men for the gospel ministry would be appealing to others. Josiah Penfield could not have been certain when he wrote his will that others would match the amount of his legacy in order that the school might be established. Surely, though, we must think of his act as one of confident uncertainty. We see the fruits of it all around us today on this beautiful campus. Even more, we know of its effects through the years as Mercer graduates have influenced their generations using the foundation of knowledge acquired here.

Some may choose to call Penfield's act one of faith. Cehtainly I have no quarrel with that. Faith is largely a confidence that uncertainties can be and will be advantageously resolved. But I think you will agree that Mercer's original benefactor could not possibly have envisioned how through the years others would expand the usefulness of what he had started.

Each one of us throughout his or her life has numberless opportunities to act decisively when it is not wholly clear what the end result of our choice will be. The fainthearted turn away from making an election. They drift and hope for the best. Others avoid true choice by electing to do that which seems to them most popular or least troublesome. They are self-satisfied conformists.

It is not likely that members of either of these groups will be long remembered. They exhibit no active desire to help shape the world in which they live. Nor to help fashion a better one for their children and their children's children. They are the raw material from which dictatorships are molded; they are the pawns of the cynical and self-seeking where elective democracy still survives. They lack a confident understanding of their own heritage sufficient to face uncertainty willingly and wisely.

I trust that all of you will exercise your right to be different from the kinds of people I have just mentioned. Your lives will be richer and much more meaningful if you do. Life may also at times seem to be much more difficult. Assuming the burdens of leadership and of personal involvement in the uncertainties of life is never easy. True leadership is undertaken only by the confidently uncertain who recognize that the onward course of individual and of community benefit depends upon people who dare to test what they are and what they know in order to accomplish worthwhile ends. You can be this kind of person. I hope you will.

There are names attached to many buildings on this campus of people who have done just that. Few of us, perhaps none, are likely to have such monuments to our memories. This does not mean that we cannot approach life with the same deep appreciation for the opportunities that exist for us to apply ourselves vigorously to leadership tasks, no matter how limited the fields may be in which we operate.

As might be expected, most of these campus buildings are named for major benefactors of this University. Few if any of them could have been built were it not for a kind of confident uncertainty that is almost peculiarly American. We all know it best as the free enterprise system, the risk-for-profit-or-loss business foundation of our country's economic greatness. An excellent course in economics could be taught here just by studying the lives and business histories of the men whose personal wealth, given directly or by their heirs, has gone into providing facilities so that the members of this and earlier graduating classes and those to come might go out into the world better trained.

Private philanthropy thrives only in an economic climate where individual effort is rewarded. Funds generated from such well-used economic opportunities create in turn the opportunities to contribute to institutions that can aid in training people to meet their own needs.

Effective government undertakings to broaden the concerns of our democratic society for the welfare of all of its members can be underwritten only with funds generated by free enterprise. Governments do not create genuine economic welfare. Individual people do this—confidently uncertain people. Without economic challenge and opportunity the idealism of man's concern for man cannot be realized as a vital force for human betterment. Every penny that the federal government taxes out of us comes from this same source. In the United States, free private business enterprise is the generator of the means which society uses to support those activities which the social conscience of our citizens demands should be done.

I'm not talking alone about the care of the impoverished and unfortunate. I speak, as well, about other things that enrich all our lives. Let's pursue the one example of Mercer. We have already mentioned its major benefactors. What they have given in the years since founding has been augumented by others who have also shared their means to the degrees possible in their financial circumstances. They have filled out the quotas in fund drives, they have contributed through their churches to the support of the University. They have shared the vision of creating a setting in which education for leadership and service can be fruitfully conducted.

The vast majority of such gifts have come from people whose incomes are an outgrowth of the American way of life. Its successful operation has been responsible for the fact that they had money to give to support the things in which they believe.

Our country is both great and able and willing to be generous because it encourages the exercise of the best that men have in them to contribute toward the upgrading of life in all areas of activity. As graduates many of you will immediately enter upon your chosen life's work. Others are looking ahead to further education before entering more specialized fields of endeavor. This sets back for only a few years the time when you will be fully active participants in the careers you have chosen.

Inevitably, all of you face decisions as to what kind of people you choose to be, whether in business or professional life. Your lives can be truly useful and productive. Or, they can span years that will be meaningless in terms of character growth and of genuine usefulness and of the achievement of ambitions. None of you need fear the latter if you persist in a confident uncertainty as you go about the business of living in the years ahead.

Closely allied to this will be finding the answers to the question, "How much do you want it?" About a year ago I was very much impressed with a sermon on this subject that began with words that I think will have deep meaning for you on this graduation day. Dr. Edward G. Latch, a well-known clergyman in Washington, started this sermon by saying:

"Have you ever considered the place of desire in the attempts to achieve your ambition? Have you ever thought about the place of the will to realize your endeavors and aims in life? Take something you want to see done . . . some objective you wish to reach . . . some task you seek to accomplish . . . some dream you would like to have fulfilled. Have you ever stopped to think about the important place desire and the will to do plays in these endeavors? More than we may be willing to admit, to a greater degree than we may realize—we succeed or fail, win or lose, largely in proportion to the feeling of desire we bring to it."

We can link these themes together. Desire and a confident uncertainty can combine to make each of you worthy opponents for the most challenging tests life can hold for you. They will make you seek out opportunities to add to the accumulated store of national character that identifies the American people. They will assure that you maintain your identity as an individual—a useful and a free man or woman. Life will be richer for you and for others as you live it fully.

None of us dare forget the strong trend of the times that runs counter to this kind of thinking. Life cannot be lived fully in the regimented existence that is the fate of vast numbers of the world's people today. There can be no confident uncertainty for these people, only a question-mark kind of fate depending upon what the state chooses to allot to them. Many of those now living in this way chose to accept an infant-like security-blanket way of life. Now, they can have can no other. And none have achieved anything approaching the American way of life. I repeat, we dare not forget this.

Ours is the better way, but it demands that we understand that a genuine idealism based on a desire to be useful to others . . . to contribute to social betterment . . . and to advance the welfare of people . . . does not require the surrender of personal initiative or the abandonment of time-proven ways in the conduct of our nation's affairs.

You will be the ones who write chapters still to come in the story of the most successful effort in the history of mankind to spread broadly the benefits of national well-being to all people. There is progress still to be made. There are new ideas and theories to be explored. Your future is in your hands and you will be moving steadily forward toward the day when full responsibility will rest upon you for decisions in business affairs . . . in political matters . . . in professional problems . . . in teaching and preaching . . . in whatever may be your sphere of activity.

Keep today's eagerness alive in your minds. Hold strongly to the idealism that marks your generation more greatly than any recent one in this country's history. But do not drift into the easy way of the conformist. Use your talents and your time and your determination to build ever more strongly on the structure that shelters the American way of life—the American free enterprise system.

Maintain a confident uncertainty. It has served others well as they met their individual challenges in our nation's past. You have been trained to begin to meet the challenges of the future. God willing, and helping, you will meet them well.

The Ney Memorial Awards Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RODNEY M. LOVE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the House information concerning the Ney Memorial Award's competition which I learned about as a result of a visit from my good friend and constituent, Mr. John C. Smith, formerly an Ohio State senator and presently a member of the Board of County Commissioners of Montgomery County, Ohio.

Mr. Smith and Maj. Walter Pienkowski, retired, another constituent—formerly food service officer for the U.S. Air Force—were the two men most responsible for the Food Service Executive's Association's participation in the Ney Memorial Award, Major Pienkowski having been the gentlemen who created a similar program in the Air Force known as the Hennessy Trophy Award.

Mr. Smith, recently returned from an inspection tour for the Navy, participated in a team evaluation of the nine finalists in this year's competition.

The Secretary of the Navy in 1958 announced the establishment of an all-Navy food service competition to give merited recognition for outstanding accomplishment in the preparation, service and management of food within the Navy.

The Navy has long considered good food as a most important factor in sustaining the high morale of its men on land, at sea and in the air. The establishment of a distinguished award naming the Navy's best feeders to a "Hall of Food Fame," known as the Ney Memorial awards program, has stimulated even greater interest and improvement in the already outstanding food service operation in Navy general messes.

The Ney Memorial awards program commemorates the late Capt. Edward Francis Ney, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, who served with distinction as head of the Subsistence Division of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts during World War II. The Ney program is administered for the Secretary of the Navy by the Commander, Naval Supply Systems Command, an office currently held by Rear Adm. H. J. Goldberg, SC, USN.

From its inception the Ney Memorial awards program has been sponsored by the Food Service Executives Association, since 1901 a national nonprofit organization of food procurement, service, and management executives. Representatives of the winning Navy general messes ashore and afloat will be guests of the association for the special plaque presentation ceremonies at the FSEA 65th National Convention from August 15 to 17 at St. Louis, Mo.

Although our Navy is advancing into the age of missiles and nuclear power the men and women who man our shore stations, ships, and planes are the key elements in its power. With the exception of leadership, probably no one thing is more important to the health and morale of these men and women than good food service.

When we consider these men and women who man the ramparts during peace and war we too often consider their morale and well-being in relation to pay and promotion, but another very direct and abiding concern of every military person is his food.

I would like to commend the members of the Food Service Executive Association for all they have done in these past 9 years by presenting these awards to the winning naval facilities for outstanding food service and for gaining the recognition of this all important factor in the health and morale of our fighting men.

The Ney Memorial awards competition has economic benefits as well. It has dramatically reduced the per man ration cost per day. In every instance, without exception, the finalists in this annual program have reduced their food costs to the Government. The program has been a deciding factor in the creation of more cheerful dining areas for our seamen. It has increased the morale of our seamen and instilled pride in our food service commissarymen. The Pacific Fleet has even included participation in the Ney Memorial award competition a must for inclusion in the "E" for excellence award. It has even encouraged one of this year's winners—U.S.S. *Semmes*—to print a cookbook of the ship's favorite receipes to send home to the ship's personnel, parents, and dependents. This cookbook has even been requested by commercial as well as private interests outside the Navy.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I was glad to know about this competition and am proud of the parents and dependents of our Navy personnel. I am reassured to find that our men are the best fed and I appreciate John Smith's interest in taking his time to make this tour and I commend him and all the finalists in this year's competition.

The winners are:

LARGE MESS AFLOAT

1. U.S.S. *Gridley* (DLG–21) (winner), Commander, Cruiser Destroyer Force, Pacific.
2. U.S.S. *H. W. Gilmore* (AS–16) (first runner-up), Commander, Submarine Force, Atlantic.
3. U.S.S. *Proteus* (AS–19) (second runner-up), Commander, Submarine Force, Pacific.

SMALL MESS AFLOAT

1. U.S.S. *Semmes* (DDG–18) (winner), Commander, Cruiser Destroyer Force, Atlantic.
2. U.S.S. *Aggressive* (MSO–422) (first runner-up), Commander, Mine Force, Atlantic.
3. U.S.S. *Skagit* (AKA–105) (second runner-up), Commander, Amphibious Force, Pacific.

ASHORE MESS

1. NAS, Miramar, Calif. (winner), Commandant, 11th Naval District.
2. NAVCOMMSTA, Sam Miguel, Philippines (first runner-up), Commander, Naval Forces, Philippines.
3. NAVSUPPACT, Naples, Italy (second runner-up), Commander, Naval Forces, Europe.

Cordell Hull Lock and Dam Rises in the Upper Cumberland Area of Tennessee as a Monument to a Great Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Cordell Hull lock and dam—currently under construction in my State—is destined to be a great instrument for progress and a monument to a great statesman—Cordell Hull—my distinguished predecessor.

This great project being built across the Cumberland River at a cost of $58 million will be a part of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers development of the Cumberland River Basin.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, it was my privilege to have had a small part in making this great development possible. This project will provide expanded water resources to the people of the upper Cumberland area in abundant supply. Hydroelectric power will be produced. Navigation and recreation will also be promoted, among other benefits.

Mr. Speaker, Tennessee magazine in a recent issue contains an article, "The Cordell Hull Project: Monument to a Statesman," featuring this great project and its significance. I include this article in the Appendix of the Record, believing it will be of interest to my colleagues and to the country generally:

THE CORDELL HULL PROJECT: MONUMENT TO A STATESMAN

(By Larry Arnett)

"We often say how impressive power is. But I do not find it impressive at all. The guns and the bombs, the rockets and the warships, are all symbols of human failure . . . A dam built across a great river is impressive." (President Lyndon B. Johnson at Johns Hopkins University April 7, 1965.)

In the prologue to the story we know today as the Cordell Hull Project, so named in honor of the late Secretary of State and Senator from Tennessee, the late President John F. Kennedy touched a telegraph key in ceremonies held at Nashville's Vanderbilt Stadium, thereby setting off an explosive some 60 miles away at the proposed damsite and officially signalling the beginning of a dream's realization.

Design, construction and operation of the project became the responsibility of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and with the completion of the dam, another chapter will have been added to the story of man's development of the water resources of the Cumberland River and its tributaries in Tennessee and Kentucky. The project is a unit of coordinated plan for control of floods and the development of the water resources of the Cumberland River Basin, and will be located approximately 5 miles above the city of Carthage, Tennessee.

Rising some 87 feet high above the stream bed, the dam will require 222,000 cubic yards of concrete and seven years to construct. It will be a combination earthfill and concrete structure about 1,306 feet long and 108 feet thick at its base, containing a gate-controlled spillway, navigation lock and power intake section. The powerhouse will occupy the present river channel with necessary appurtenances on the right descending bank. It will be joined by a concrete spillway section flanked on the left by a lock and that structure by an earthen embankment. Construction was initiated in May, 1963 and it is anticipated that the project—the dam being the key structure of a $57 million unit that includes a reservoir, powerplant and switchyard—can be completed for full beneficial use by December, 1969.

The project is presently planned for the primary purposes of navigation, hydropower generation and recreation. As a unit of the Cumberland Basin plan, the project will function to produce hydroelectric power by use of flows regulated by existing upstream reservoirs, Wolf Creek and Dale Hollow; afford recreational opportunities and wildlife conservation; and under flood conditions, to provide for temporary storage and regulation of large flows as well as recreational craft, and will provide a powerful stimulus to the economic growth of the area. With Old Hickory and Cheatham (completed) and Barkley (nearing completion), Cordell Hull ultimately will provide a modern 9 foot channel 385 miles from the mouth of the Cumberland River to the vicinity of Celina, Tennessee.

At its maximum flood control capacity of 13,920 acre-feet, the reservoir will extend 72 river miles to the proposed site of the Celina Dam at the Kentucky-Tennessee State line. It will lie within Smith, Jackson and Clay Counties, Tennessee.

The powerplant, which will occupy almost half the breadth of the riverbed, is nearing completion. It will be operated so as to use as much of the water flow as possible for power production. During periods of high streamflow, the spillway gates will be opened to pass the water beyond the capacity of the turbines, with due regard for the retention and regulation of floodwaters through surcharge operation. The upper portion of the reservoir, corresponding to a seven-foot depth above the normal headwater level in flood seasons, is provided for surcharge storage. This storage space is utilized by raising all of the spillway gates in small, equal increments, thus permitting passage of some water under them but retaining or forcing into storage all inflow to the reservoir in excess of the spillway discharge and power releases.

The plant will house three 33.34 megawatt generating units which will provide a total power output of 100 megawatts. Power will be generated as the water from the reservoir passes through gate-controlled intakes into the powerhouse, rotates the turbines, and discharges through draft tubes into the river below the dam. The electric current is produced by generators mounted on the same shafts with the turbines. Installation of the first generating unit is scheduled for completion in March, 1971, with the remaining units scheduled for completion shortly thereafter.

The powerplant will initially generate 350 million kilowatt hours of electricity annually. Power from the Cordell Hull Project has already been allocated to meet the growing needs of preference customers such as the rural electric cooperatives and municipalities.

Hydroelectric power will be produced by the project for distribution in a region which continues to experience rapidly increasing power demands. In multiple purpose development of water resources, power is a paying partner. The revenues from this power will be returned to the Treasury of the United States—with interest.

In addition to the protection from floods, the public will also be afforded the use and enjoyment of other big benefits to be realized with the completion of the project. For example, the man-made lakes will provide annual recreation for the millions who seek it in one of the many forms of outdoor diversions—fishing, boating, swimming, waterskiing, camping or sightseeing.

Major boat ramps are also in the making for construction at locations to be designated in the near future. Fish and wildlife enhancement and conservation will also be realized with the completion of the project. The Tennessee Fish and Game Department plans to stock the reservoir with smallfry and fingerlings, in order to assure opportunities for fishing as soon as possible, and proposes to develop neighboring areas for wildlife use.

When fully completed, the Cordell Hull Project will mark another step gained in the march toward the goal of full development of the water resources of the Cumberland Valley and will have unlocked a vast new area to a bright tomorrow or greater economic growth, security and social well being through its direct benefits.

A Tribute to the Remarkable Taggart Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TENO RONCALIO
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a remarkable thing these days when the family unit of our society can be recognized as a powerful force for good in its own right, as is being done in Wyoming this week, when the entire State pays tribute to one of its outstanding clans, the Taggart family of the Big Horn Basin in Wyoming.

In 75 years of statehood, Wyoming has only had a Democratic Member of this body for 6 years—only two of my predecessors have been of my political party; one of these was Paul R. Greever of Cody, Wyo., whose son, William H. Greever, is married to one of the nine children of the "Capo de famiglia" Lloyd Taggart. Lloyd and his wife, Louise, are today celebrating their 50th wedding anniversary in Cody, Wyo.

THE 1920 CELEBRATION

In 1920 the parents of Lloyd Taggart, in Cowley, Wyo., celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary. In the earlier family there were 16 children born, and at their 50th wedding anniversary the 15 living children of that family each performed a musical rendition.

As reported by the Lovell, Wyo., Chronicle in those days, after an hour of dancing there was a musical program by the Taggart family. The nine stalwart sons and six beautiful daughters rendered a series of old songs learned in childhood. The Chronicle had this to say:

> The presentation of such a musical program, displaying professional talent on the part of the soloists, to say nothing of the wonderful harmony produced by the chorus, was the more remarkable from a single family. To those privileged to hear it, it was perhaps the only occasion of the kind in a lifetime. More remarkable was the picture the group presented on the stage. Fifteen grown men and women, brothers and sisters—physically perfect, keen mentality, and talented far beyond the average who commercialize their talents. And the father and mother of this group appearing in equally good form with the children.

OUTSTANDING PIONEER FAMILY

This is one of the outstanding pioneer families of Wyoming. Lloyd is one of the surviving 4 of the original 16 and I want to pay special tribute today to the 9 children of Lloyd and Louise, with 4 of whom I was privileged to be a classmate at the University of Wyoming, and particularly to the one member of the family, Mary Louise, who keeps alive the two-party tradition in the family. The children are:

Ruth, now Mrs. Quentin Blair of Cody.

Lloyd Welch, the president of Taggart Construction Co., Cody.

Jesse McNiven, the vice president of Taggart Construction Co., Cody.

Mary Louise, now Mrs. William H. Greever, the wife of a Cody engineer.

Harriet, now Mrs. Joe Brytus, the wife of a retired officer of the U.S. Air Force, living in Sheridan, Wyo.

Becky Barbara, Mrs. Jay Watkins, wife of the president of W.M.K. Transit Mix, Las Vegas, Nev.

Scott Hinckley, a Boeing aircraft engineer, Paris, France.

Raye Rita, Mrs. Scott Graham, the wife of an investment consultant in New London, Conn.

Charles Welch, a real estate investment broker, Salt Lake City, Utah.

AN INSPIRATION TO YOUNG PEOPLE

One of Mr. Taggart's greatest attributes is that he has always been helpful to the young people of Wyoming, regardles of their ethnic or economic or social status. He was always helping young people at the university while I was there. I am proud that he is a citizen of Wyoming and I consider him an outstanding friend and mentor.

The Taggart family has been distinguished by its talented and hard-working members. The family embodies many of the everlasting virtues which have helped make this country great. Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is only fitting that they should receive national recognition by this tribute in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This Nation and the State of Wyoming send their best wishes to Lloyd and Louise Taggart on their 50th wedding anniversary and hope for the continued strength and vitality of a great American group, the Taggart family.

Graduation Address of Dr. Edward Teller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of Clemson University, its past history, its superb setting, and foresee for Clemson a great and unlimited future.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent Clemson University in the U.S. Congress. I am proud of its distinguished and illustrious president, Dr. Robert C. Edwards. I am proud of its outstanding, dedicated and highly capable faculty.

Dr. Edward Teller, of the University of California, delivered a magnificent commencement address to the 70th commencement at Clemson, May 14, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Dr. Teller's superb and timely address to each Member of the Congress and to the people of the United States:

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY GRADUATION ADDRESS, 70TH COMMENCEMENT, MAY 14, 1966, CLEMSON, S.C.

(By Edward Teller, chairman, Department of Engineering, Applied Science, University of California, Davis, May 14, 1966)

Governor McNair, Senator Brown, President Edwards, ladies and gentlemen, and very particularly you young men and young women who will go from here, from this wonderful occasion, from the sunshine into a world to use what you have learned.

When I arrived here yesterday I seem to remember, it hardly appears real now, but it was drizzling and at dinner everbody said "What will be the weather tomorrow?" There was a weather prediction which indicated improvement but, as is the case sometimes, there was also doubt.

I want to tell you that ten years from now probably there won't be any doubt. Weather will be predicted and as soon as weather will be predicted we shall begin to learn how to influence weather and then we will have done something very remarkable. We will have lost the last safe topic of conversation.

I am telling you this for a serious reason. The most valuable human property, which I'm afraid we have inherited from our simian ancestors, is curiosity. Properly channeled by learning, this leads to knowledge, and knowledge leads to power, power even over the elements, over the weather. And this power, without any possibility of evasion, leads to responsibility.

We are living in a scientific revolution, the increase of knowledge and consequent increase of power propels us from decade to decade even from year to year with ever increasing speed into an uncertain future. You may be afraid of it, you may also be challenged by it. This problem of the weather is only one example, there are others.

The increasing population needs food. Many of you will be directly concerned with production of food, but probably even within your lifetime you may see that production of food which has been mostly confined to the land areas will return to the oceans; from where originally all life on this planet has come.

We have already started to break the bonds that tie us to this planet. We are exploring space, we are encountering more and more opportunities, and in so encountering opportunities we also meet with ever increasing problems because human power applies and always was applied to the particularly horrible application, the power to destroy each other.

Do not believe those who assert that there is danger that the human race may end. There is no such danger. But there is the reality that today human inventions can span the distance between continents in minutes, that today as a nation we are no safer than Poland was in 1939 when Hitler's army started to march.

All of this, the opportunity and the danger, means something very simple. It means, and I believe that this is true no matter how difficult the job of a prophet, it means that by the end of this twentieth century there will be established some world order, some way in which all people of different origins, of different traditions, of different races must live together because one thing that the technological and scientific revolution has done is to make this planet a very small place where indeed we are all neighbors.

A changing time is a difficult time. The human animal like every living being is a creature of habit, of emotions—he is apt to act tomorrow as he acted yesterday. Thus we form a stable community. For that purpose emotions are well qualified to serve as a guide. But in a time when change has become unavoidable we must use our understanding; we must use our head, and in using our head at the same time we must never forget that we have hearts also, that we and others are strange, contradictory, terrible and wonderful human beings.

When you are faced with the necessity of change, there are two great dangers. One is, and it is a widespread danger, that you do not recognize the necessity that you allow events to get into the saddle and then you lose initiative and you have to react in a violent manner. It is hard to realize that tomorrow's world will be more different from today, than yesterday was as compared to the present hour, yet this is true, and this everyone must realize. To my mind the fact that more and more of our young people go through college, even go into graduate school, is the one reasonable response to the rapid change which we must face.

There is another danger. You may recognize that change is necessary; having recognized it you find a solution: the world must be organized, we must have world government. I have solved everything and I have solved precisely nothing. A word is not a solution, an idea is not an act. We must learn how to live together and if you remember the problems that you encounter in cooperating with your close associates, even sometimes with your own family, you might begin to recognize how much bigger the problems are to live with for those who have a different past, a different language, a different set of ideas and ideals—so different that you may sometimes imagine that they come from another world.

Therefore I can speak properly only about problems. I cannot, in a responsible manner, speak about solutions and yet I will do so, not because I believe that what I'm going to say is right. What I've said up to now, is I am sure, correct, please believe me. But from here on, believe me at your own risk. I am saying it, not because I am completely convinced, but I'm continuing to speak in order to demonstrate to you that the problems I'm talking about are real and that however difficult a question, however uncertain the answer, I feel a duty to tackle the problem by starting a discussion.

The world will have much more organization by the time you are my age. When new organizations are growing, that is the time when the foundations for the future, perhaps for hundreds of years, perhaps even for longer, are laid.

There is in this world a big dynamic force. If I call this force communism then you may have an idea what I'm talking about, but you may also misunderstand what is worrying me. What is worrying me is not particularly the difference between the communist economy and the capitalist economy. The communist economy has to adopt and has adopted many of the procedures of the capitalist society, and we in turn are introducing regulations which in an ever more complicated world may indeed be necessary. It may seem that the difference between the economic systems is diminishing. But if you think of our difficulties in this way I believe that you are missing the main point.

Seven hundred and fifty years ago Genghis Khan set out to conquer the world. He called himself the Great Khan of all men, and indeed he did conquer a greater portion of the world than anyone ever did before or after. And where he conquered, there he left his traces.

Look at the map and compare it with your books of history and you will find that almost precisely in the same places that have been conquered by Genghis Khan, today there is communism. The difference, to my mind, is not a difference between economic systems. It is a difference between a highly organized, authoritarian, tyrannic government and the strange paradoxical, yet vital invention, the self-government of free men.

There is a real question whether in an ever smaller world, the world indeed can continue to be divided between freedom and between a tyrannical regime. This is not a question that can be settled in a right way by fighting. It is also not a question that can be settled by wishful thinking and by imagining that a tradition of more than seven centuries will change within a few years. But it is a question that has to be attacked, and this is how I would like to see it attacked.

To go ahead and find a common basis between the men of the Kremlin and our own government is to my mind simple nonsense. To find a common basis, a thoroughly worked-out method of cooperation between all advanced democracies who do have the same history, who do have the same ideals, who do have the same respect for the individual and the same ideas about freedom, this is a difficult task but not an impossible one. A loose but effective union of the free can become the one reliable point, the fixed point from which we can begin to change and to shape the world toward a better future, not by violence, but by strength and patience.

These are generalities, they are important generalities. At least we are opening up questions that need answers and for which answers are being generated by reason or by accident, by understanding or by rash action.

Why do I talk to you about these things? You may feel, I am sure you do feel, that the world is big and overwhelming and that you are small and without power. Some of you may have read the famous book, "Plato's Republic," in which the terrible idea is explained, that a few highly intelligent, highly educated and completely unselfish people, the philosophers, should govern the world. This is a terrible idea and it is a mistaken idea in my mind, mistaken for a strange reason.

The world is too complex, to leave the decisions, all the decisions, to the best, to a few. This technological world, this human society is shot through with an infinity, an almost infinity of small and highly significant problems, each of which can change the fate of the world, each of which in its consequences can and will be magnified. Those of you who go into work in science will create the tools of tomorrow and many of the tools are likely to be very significant in answering the qestion, what tomorrow will be. Those of you who go into industry will have to have an open eye for using these tools, for adapting them. Those of you who will teach our children have probably the most responsible position, although not the one that has nearly as much honor as it should have.

And those of you who may go away over the Pacific Ocean to defend the chance of some people to make a choice—people, many of whom probably have not yet understood nor even had a possibility to understand what the choice before them is; to those of you who may face a personal danger, we shall be in the greatest debt. Whether your action is one of courage or whether it is to understand and to befriend a person of a different continent, you will change our future.

It is a very great privilege for me to talk to you because I do feel that each of you is going to have an important part in what is going to hapen. And within limits I can tell you what is going to hapen. The world is moving and the world is going to continue to move. There will be an organization and this may have the simple machine-like structure. The simple structure, not too complicated for the mind of a conqueror on horseback who has ridden out to conquer the world in the beginning of the thirteenth century; and this rigid scheme may be the mold of the world for farther than we can think ahead.

Or it may be that by patience, by understanding, by hard work, and by the love of our neighbors, wherever they are and whatever they are, we might be able to transform this strange invention of self-government, of democracy, into a system that will enbrace the globe.

The future may be much worse than the present or it may be so much better that we shall not be able to look back to this day without wondering how all these changes that you, yourself, have made did come about. The one thing of which I am sure is that the world will not be the same. Please change it the right way.

The Anheuser-Busch Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, within the past 10 days the House has had called to its attention on several occasions the coincidental circumstances of the dismissal of the antitrust action against Anheuser-Busch and the membership of several of the top executives of that company in the Democrat fundraising effort known as the President's Club.

On July 15, I wrote to the Attorney General to inquire of him as to the legal basis for the dismissal of the Anheuser-Busch suit as contrasted to the continuation of prosecution of antitrust actions involving three Milwaukee-based breweries.

A copy of my letter to Mr. Katzenbach is set forth as follows:

JULY 15, 1966.

Hon. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
The Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The recent revelation of the dismissal of the anti-trust action against Anheuser-Busch Brewing Company has raised several questions and prompted me to seek explanation and clarification.

As you know, I represent a part of the Milwaukee metropolitan area where there has been, over the years, considerable public discussion of the pending anti-trust actions involving three of the Milwaukee-based breweries. As I understand it, the anti-trust action against Anheuser-Busch, the largest brewing company in the entire country, with a capacity in excess of ten million gallons, involved the purchase of the Rahr Malting Company, a Wisconsin firm with a significant capacity for providing an important element of the production of beer. This dismissal seems difficult to reconcile with the prosecution of the anti-trust action against the Schlitz Brewing Company, now pending in the United States Supreme Court, involving a company fifteen percent smaller in its capacity than Anheuser-Busch. As I understand the Schlitz action, the Justice Department seeks to void the proposed purchase of a minority interest in Labatt, a Canadian brewing firm which apparently owns a majority interest in an American West Coast firm, the General Brewing Company.

The dismissal of the Anheuser-Busch suit also seems difficult to reconcile with the currently pending suit in the U.S. District Court for Eastern Wisconsin seeking to void the eight-year-old merger of the Blatz and Pabst brewing companies with a combined capacity of less than five percent of the national output.

I wish to make it clear that I have never received any complaint from the officials of Schlitz, Blatz or Pabst. I simply have been unable, as a Member of Congress to reconcile these pending actions with the rather flippant explanation, as reported in the press, that the Anheuser-Busch case was "a weak case which never should have been started in the first place."

How can the public understand the weakness of an anti-trust case against the largest brewing firm in the country, which seeks to solidify and enhance its predominant position by the acquisition of a significant source of supply (thus denying that source of supply to its competitors) while smaller companies seeking to approach a competitive position with Anheuser-Busch are being vigorously prosecuted for violating the anti-trust laws?

Very sincerely yours,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Member of Congress.

One week later, I received a letter from Mr. Donald F. Turner, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, responding to my letter. Mr. Turner's letter of response is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1966.

Hon. GLENN R. DAVIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAVIS: The Attorney General has asked me to reply to your letter of July 15 concerning the relationship between the recently dismissed Anheuser-Busch suit and our cases against Schlitz Brewing Company and Pabst Brewing Company. As you indicate in your letter, the Anheuser-Busch case involved a "vertical" merger, while the Schlitz and Pabst cases involved "horizontal" acquisitions of competitors. We are indeed concerned with vertical acquisitions of a source of supply that may threaten to put a supply squeeze on the acquirer's competitors. The suit against Anheuser-Busch attacking its acquisition of the Rahr Malting Plant was filed at a time when it apparently was believed that that acquisition and similar acquisitions by other brewers would indeed threaten smaller competitors with future difficulties. On our recent review of the case it appeared fairly clear to us that there was no serious likelihood of this occurring. There is, and has been for some time, considerable excees capacity in the malt industry; no further trend toward vertial acquisitions has developed; and because of the relative size of malt plants, it does not seem at all likely that a significant number of acquisitions will take place in the future. However, we insisted that the suit be dismissed only "without prejulice," so that the Department remained free to reinstitute proceedings in the future should any adverse developments warranting such action take place.

In both the Schlitz and Pabst cases, on the other hand, we proceeded against mergers between substantial competitors. In this area, the Department has quite consistently taken the position—recently vindicated by the Supreme Court in the Pabst and Von's Grocery opinions—that serious market concentration, with its attendant ill-effects on competition, can only be effectively stopped at an early age. In short, if you will excuse an oversimplification, we have felt by and large that the merger of any two substantial competitors should be at least prima facie unlawful.

In the Schlitz case, we attacked the acquisitions by Schlitz of Burgermeister, a west coast brewery, and a stock interest in LaBatt's, a Canadian brewery controlling General Brewing Company, another west coast brewer. In 1960, the year before Schlitz acquired Burgermeister, Burgermeister accounted for 10% of beer sales in California, and Schlitz accounted for 3 to 4%. General Brewing was also a substantial seller in that area. Moreover, there was considerable evidence indicating that LaBatt's would in the future seek to expand General Brewing's sales area and attempt to convert it into a nationwide seller. On the basis of these and other facts, the federal district court recently held both acquisitions by Schlitz to be unlawful. We understand that Schlitz is contemplating an appeal.

As for the Pabst case, at the time of the acquisition Blatz was the leading seller of beer in Wisconsin with 12.8% of total sales in that state, while Pabst, the acquirer and one of the nation's leading sellers, accounted for approximately 11%. The merger made Pabst number one in the state. Again, therefore, the Government has been attacking a merger between two substantial competitors, and as you know, the Supreme Court has recently held that the Government established a prima facie case in violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act.

I hope this discussion, although brief, suffices to answer your questions. Please let me know if it does not.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD F. TURNER,
Assistant Attorney General,
Antitrust Division.

Mr. Speaker, I do not question the validity of the legal positions set forth in Mr. Turner's letter. It is a lawyer-like letter deserving of respect as such.

Meantime, the distinguished Pulitzer Prize winning columnist for the Des Moines Register, Clark Mollenhoff, has given new insight into the internal workings of the Antitrust Division during the time of consideration of the Anheuser-Busch decisions of the Justice Department.

These additional revelations raise some questions to which the answers have not been provided. If this matter is not put to rest in a manner more satisfactory to the public, it may well be that the Congress has a responsibility to interest itself in this case and that the Judiciary Committee of the House will need to exercise its broad powers of oversight and investigation to assure the members of the House and to assure the public that the public interest has neither been sacrificed nor compromised.

PRESSURE BY BEER FIRM IN TRUST SUIT

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Justice Department records indicate that the Anheuser-Busch Co. used "political pressure" to try to bring a settlement on the highly controversial antitrust suit involving acquisition of a Wisconsin malting company.

The settlement of the suit by the Johnson administration has been subject to Republican criticism since it was settled during the same period that owners and representatives of Anheuser-Busch were making political contributions of $10,000 to the President's Club.

PLANE TRIP

Also involved in the controversy is the fact that Donald F. Turner, head of the Antitrust Division, went to the All-Star baseball game in St. Louis in a plane owned by Anheuser-Busch. The plane ride took place only three weeks after the antitrust action was dis- on recommendation of Turner.

Alfred Fleishman, the public relations man who arranged for the $10,000 in contributions to the President's Club, has said there was no political pressure in connection with the settlement of the Anheuser-Busch case and no discussions of the antitrust case with the Democratic Party people who accepted the $10,000.

The files of the Justice Department show that the trial lawyers assigned to the Anheuser-Busch case were opposed to dismissal of the action.

Trial lawyers John F. Hughes and David R. Melincoff in a memorandum of May 9, 1966, set out the historic background of the case from the time it was filed in January, 1962, on the recommendations of Lee Loevinger, then the head of the antitrust division.

Anheuser-Busch lawyers tried to obtain a settlement in 1962 and 1963, and relative to one of these efforts in December, 1963, Hughes and Melincoff made the following comment:

"At that time, as Mr. (Baddic J.) Rashid (chief, trial section) is aware, Anheuser was not the least bit hesitant to bring political pressure to bear from among others, Senators (Stuart) Symington and (Edward) Long of Missouri."

The trial attorneys contended that the lawyers for Anheuser-Busch tried to avoid a trial and had halted the "discovery" process by indicating a willingness to settle with a consent decree at several stages.

However, the trial attorneys said this appeared to them to be "dragging heels" for purposes of delay during which time the firm was operating the Rahr Malting Co. at Manitowoc, Wis.

DENY VIOLATION

Edward Barton, a lawyer for Anheuser-Busch, contended that the acquisition would not be a violation of the antitrust laws, and asked "whose interest the department (of justice) seeks to protect since all brewers, former customers of Rahr, have alternate supplies."

Hughes and Melincoff replied: "Our answer is that the public interest will be protected by retaining a vigorous competition in the malt and beer industries as possible in light of oligopolistic tendencies in both industries."

They stated that "in one swoop the nation's largest brewer (Anheuser-Busch) acquired 9 per cent of all production of malt."

In his recommendation to dismiss the case, Turner in a June 8, 1966, memorandum stated: "With great reluctance, since I believe there should be a strong presumption against taking such action, I recommend that we consent to the dismissal without prejudice of the above civil complaint. I have had the case carefully analyzed by several staff people, and am convinced the facts simply do not support any of the possible theories which I would consider appropriate."

In the memorandum, Turner said there might be some impact of the dismissal of the Anheuser-Busch case on other pending cases, but commented that the Justice Department is "not wholly unprepared to distinguish between" the Anheuser-Busch dismissal and other cases they do not intend to dismiss.

TIMING OF GIFT

Representative Charles Goodell (Rep., N.Y.) has put together a chronology of the events showing that the contributions of $10,000 to the President's Club took place in mid-May, during the same period that the Justice Department was making a decision to dismiss the suit.

Representative Goodell and others have raised the question as to whether the whole idea of large contributions to the President's Club does not leave an inference of a link with "influence peddling."

Goodell claimed in a statement in Thursday's Congressional Record that official files fail to show any "significant contributions" to presidential campaigns prior to this year by officials of Anheuser-Busch.

Republican House Leader Gerald Ford of Michigan and Goodell have asked for a full investigation of the handling of the Anheuser-Busch case. Goodell has also asked for a full accounting of how the $10,000 was brought to Washington, whether it was delivered in cash or in checks, to whom it was delivered and where.

Fleishman told The Register that "the money was not delivered to the Democratic National Committee in cash."

Vincent Lopez in a "Salute to Canada"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of attending the "Salute to Canada" in honor of our neighboring country to the north recently, arranged by Vincent Lopez, the prominent musician, orchestra leader, good neighbor, and numerologist.

This salute took place at the Hotel Taft in the heart of my district where Vincent Lopez holds forth nightly in the Rendezvous Room, and was 16th in a continuing series of good will events for countries with which the United States has had friendly relations.

Evelyn Eisenstadt has provided me with all of the details, which I am happy to bring to the attention of my colleagues:

Vincent Lopez' "Salute to Canada," Thursday Evening, June 30, 1966, Hotel Taft Rendezvous Room, New York, 16th in the Vincent Lopez Series of Salutes to Foreign Countries

On Thursday evening, June 30, 1966, Vincent Lopez presented a "Salute to Canada" from the Rendezvous Room at the Hotel Taft, New York City, in cooperation with the Canadian Consulate General, Canadian Government Travel Bureau, Air Canada, the Agent General of Quebec, the Industrial Commissioner of the Province of Ontario, the Manager of the Nova Scotia Travel Bureau, the Centennial Commission and the Universal and International Exhibition of 1967 at Montreal together with Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railways. This spectacular "Salute to Canada" was highlighted by Canada's upcoming 1967 Centennial of Confederation and the Universal and International Exhibition of 1967 at Montreal. Of particular significance is the fact that this "Salute to Canada" was presented on the eve of the 99th birthday of Canada which was on the first of July and, that Canada will celebrate its 100th Anniversary during 1967 with centennial celebrations across Canada and a first category World Fair at Montreal.

The guest list, headed by His Honour R. G. G. Smith, Consul General of Canada, included His Excellency P. Dupuy, Ambassador at Large and Commissioner General for Expo '67, Mr. G. Cox the Acting Permanent Representative of Canada to the United Nations, Mr. C. Chartier, Agent General for the Province of Quebec, Mr. F. Mooney, Industrial Commissioner for the Province of Ontario, The Honorable Theodore R. Kupferman, Representative from New York City, and Mrs. Kupferman, Commissioner J. O'Brien, City of New York Public Events representative of the Mayor, and many other distinguished and prominent Americans and Canadians.

Portions of this 4 hour "Salute" were carried live by the CBS radio network from 9:00 PM to 9:30 PM in Vincent Lopez' familiar "Getting to Know You" program. This radio program was broadcast to the U.S. Armed Forces and to other overseas outlets. In addition, Voice of America taped on-the-spot interviews with Mr. Lopez, the Canadian Consul General and other important dignitaries present.

It is worthwhile to note that this "Salute to Canada" is the 16th in the Vincent Lopez series of "Salutes" to foreign countries which he conducts periodically from the Hotel Taft, as a patriotic and good-will gesture. The idea of "Saluting" foreign countries in this manner, which Mr. Lopez initiated in 1961, came about through President Kennedy's expressed desire in his many speeches for interchange of visitors to and from this country, as a means of projecting better understanding between them. And, he has continued these "Salutes" in line with President Johnson's present and similar desire for furtherance of good-will and better understanding through visitors from foreign countries to ours.

In a way, the Vincent Lopez "Salutes" are offered as a "Cultural Exchange" set to music; the initial one was to France in May 1961. Since that time, in addition to the one in the present instance, his "Salutes" to foreign countries have included Tahiti, Mexico, Italy, India, Portugal, Pakistan, Scandinavian countries, Greece, the Federal Republic of Germany, Australia, Scotland, among others, with many more to follow.

It is worthwhile to note, too, that Mr. Lopez has received 12 citations from the Treasury Department for his work along those lines, in addition to innumerable commendations in recognition of his interest in the furtherance of internatonal good will through his "Salutes."

Herman Greenberg, President, Greater Springfield, Mass., AFL-CIO Council, Honored for 25 Years of Civic and Labor Union Leadership to His Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, for 25 years my good friend Herman Greenberg, president of the Greater Springfield AFL–CIO, has given dedicated and responsible leadership to his community and the labor movement. On the evening of June 16, more than 500 Greater Springfield business, civic, and labor union leaders gathered at the Kimball Towers in Springfield for a well-deserved testimonial honoring Herman Greenberg.

Since 1941, Herman Greenberg has earned the respect and gratitude of union members and citizens in all walks of life for his unselfish and successful efforts to make Greater Springfield a better place in which to live. On his silver anniversary as leader of the AFL–CIO Council for Greater Springfield, I want to join again with the business, civic, and labor union leadership of

Greater Springfield in a salute to Herman Greenberg for a job well done and convey to him our best wishes for continued success in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, with permission granted I include with my remarks a list of the head table guests and committee members for the Herman Greenberg testimonial, and a news story from the Springfield Union of June 17, 1966, concerning the testimonial:

HEAD TABLE

Sol C. Chaikin, Associate Director, Northeast Dept. ILGWU–AFL–CIO.

George J. Abair, Financial Secretary, Greater Springfield AFL–CIO Council.

John F. Albano, First Vice President, Greater Springfield AFL–CIO Council.

William Belanger, Director, Mass. Division of Employment Security.

Normand Belisle, Recording Secretary, Greater Springfield AFL–CIO Council.

Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts Second District.

Salvatore Camelio, President, Mass. State Labor Council, AFL–CIO.

Monsignor John Patrick Carroll-Abbing, Director, Boys' Town of Italy.

Maurice A. Donahue, Senate President, Mass., State Legislature.

Mrs. Herman Greenberg.

Judge Daniel M. Keyes, Jr.

Philip Kramer, Vice President ILGWU–AFL–CIO.

James P. Loughlin, Secretary-Treasurer, Mass. State Labor Council, AFL–CIO.

Aaron Posnik, Cochairman, Testimonial Committee.

James J. Reilly, Second Vice President, Greater Springfield AFL–CIO Council.

Matthew J. Ryan, Jr., District Attorney, Hampden County.

Joseph A Salerno, New England Regional Director, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, AFL–CIO.

Robert E. Samble, President, Pioneer Valley United Fund.

James J. Shea, Sr., President, Milton Bradley Co.

Rev. Emerson W. Smith, Executive Director Springfield Council of Churches.

Rabbi Herman E. Snyder, Sinai Temple.

Anna Sullivan, Treasurer, Greater Springfield AFL–CIO Council.

Hugh Thompson, Director, Region 1, AFL–CIO.

HONORARY CHAIRMEN

Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND, Salvatore Camelio, Sol C. Chaikin, Joseph A. Salemo.

TESTIMONIAL COMMITTEE

Co-Chairmen: John F. Albano, Aaron Posnik, Anna B. Sullivan.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND SPONSORS

George J. Abair, Ben C. Amsden, Joseph A. Aveni, Theodore W. Bamforth, Normand Belisle, Gustave Berman, Milton Berman, Charles H. Brinkmann, Edward Brunelle, Daniel B. Buckley.

Sante M. Caldarola, Allan A. Campbell, Cenze C. Cantalini, Mario P. Cantalini, Julia Carotenuto, Edward J. Carroll, Joseph S. Casey, Harold Chernock, Edward B. Cooley, Sidney M. Cooley.

John A. Deegan, Anthony F. DiFillippo, Joseph DiFlumera, Armando Dinauro, Stanley E. Dominick, Frank Foster, Shefford S. Goldband, David Goren, James L. Grimaldi, Jerome Guagliardo.

Richard Higgins, George Hitas, Charles Hood, Peter J. Houser, Samuel T. Izenstein, Richard F. Jameson, John Kaczmarski, Joseph Kawie, Edward J. King, Martha M. Kisser.

John Koss, James J. Landers, Albert Lebeau, Sr., Francis Leclair, George Lesnow, Max Levine, Gerald J. Mason, William McLean, Stephen A. Moynahan, Nathan Nirenstein.

Max Neigher, Edward J. O'Connor, Michael Pagliaro, Andrew Palpini, Gerald J. Parish, John Penzo, Cornelius W. Phillips, Jr., Aaron Posnik, Jay A. Posnik, Sy Posnick.

Thomas R. Rawson, James J. Reilly, Matthew J. Ryan, Jr., Robert E. Samble, William Shapiro, James J. Shea, Jr., Robert Simpson, Otto Steininger, Harry Storin, John Sullivan.

Benny Szarian, George B. Tazzini, Edward J. Urbec, Mary S. Vaz, Joseph Venti, Norman R. Vester, Samuel Walker, Daniel M. Walsh, Jr., Albert Zankl, Emilio J. Zucco.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, June 17, 1966]

GREENBERG'S 25 YEARS AS UNION CHIEF MARKED—OLD FRIENDS GATHER AT TESTIMONIAL FOR AFL–CIO HEAD

More than 500 business leaders, civic luminaries and union officials gathered Thursday night in the Kimball Towers for a testimonial honoring Herman Greenberg, president for 25 years of the Greater Springfield AFL–CIO Labor Council.

GUEST SPEAKERS

Guest speakers included long-time associates of Greenberg in the labor movement that has realized, as the council president put it, the "dreams" of a quarter century ago.

The feted labor leader briefly reminisced about his career in union organizing activities. He cited the sense of accomplishment that motivated him and the feeling of personal, humane betterment he derived.

"My only hope," Greenberg said, "is that I may have 25 more years to continue my work."

CANDIDATES ATTEND

Political aspirants dominated the roster of guest speakers as the role of Greenberg in shaping Western Massachusetts labor policies was vividly described through personal contacts over the years.

Speakers included former Atty. Gen. Edward J. McCormack, Jr., Democratic candidate for governor; former Gov. Endicott Peabody, Democratic candidate for U.S. Senator; and former Lt. Gov. Francis X. Bellotti, Democratic candidate for attorney general.

Others speaking included State Senate President Maurice Donahue, U.S. Rep. Edward P. Boland, Salvatore A. Camelio, president of the Massachusetts AFL–CIO Labor Council, and James J. Shea, Sr., president of Milton Bradley Co.

TOASTMASTER

Toastmaster for the event was Sol C. Chaikin, international vice-president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and associate director of the organization's Northeast Department, largest single unit within the ILGWU.

A fiery speech scoring the "unmotivated generation of today" was made by Joseph Salerno, international vice-president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, AFL–CIO.

The labor movement, Salerno said, is losing its momentum because today's young people are "enslaved by affience." Salerno said that 25 years ago there was only $8 billion extended annually in national credit while today there is more than $94 billion out in personal loans.

SPENT BEFORE EARNED

"Today's workers are hot about to speak out," Salerno said. "They're too busy spending next week's pay before it is even earned."

Also speaking at the event was Rt. Rev. John P. Carroll-Abbing, founder of nine Boys Towns and a Girls Town in Italy. The monsignor told of his long association with Greenberg who was outstandingly active in fund-raising campaigns in this area for the youth groups.

A presentation to Greenberg, citing him for his many years of work publicly here, was made by Robert Samble, president of Pioneer Valley United Fund. Samble said that Greenberg, first vice-president of the group, had shared his efforts with all levels of the community to make this city a better place to live in.

GAINS WERE "DREAMS"

Greenberg, who immigrated to this country as a youth from Russia, said that in the early days of his career such workers' gains as pensions, fringe benefits, paid holidays and vacations were just "dreams."

He said these gains had been realized and it was time now for the labor movement to aspire to even higher goals. Union ambitions, he said, would likely again be characterized as "dreams" but he urged labor leaders to take a lesson from the past.

Greenberg's rolé in the labor movement started in 1936 when he took an active part in the organization of Local 290, Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, AFL–CIO, at the Asinof plant in Chicopee. The following year he was elected president of the local.

GETS STATE POST

In 1941 Greenberg was elected president of the Western Massachusetts CIO Industrial Union Council and shortly after was elected to the executive board of the state labor council. From 1941 to 1945 he served on the War Manpower Commission, the U.S. Treasury Bond Committee and the executive board of the United War Fund.

In 1944 Greenberg was appointed Western Massachusetts coordinator for the national CIO Political Action Committee and subsequently held various offices on the state Democratic committee. He has also served on the boards of directors of the Springfield Community Chest and the American Red Cross.

Greenberg has been vice-president of the local United Fund since 1952. He was a member of the city's Board of Public Welfare from 1941 to 1951 and served as chairman for three years. In 1950, he was named chairman of the state Personnel Appeal Board.

Head table guests at the testimonial included George J. Abair, the local labor council's financial secretary; Normand Belisle, recording secretary; Hugh Thompson, director of AFL–CIO Region 1 in New England, and Philip Kramer, ILGWU vice-president.

Also, J. William Belanger, former president of the state council and now director of the state Division of Employment Security; Dist. Atty. Matthew J. Ryan, Jr., James P. Reilly, second vice-president of the local council and president of Local 11, United Rubber Workers Union; Rev. Emerson W. Smith, executive director of the Greater Springfield Council of Churches, and Rabbi Herman E. Snyder of Sinai Temple.

Testimonial cochairmen included John F. Albano, first vice-president of the local council; Aaron Posnik; and Anna Sullivan, council treasurer.

Report of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great privilege to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy for 1966. Included with this report is the entire composition of the Board. My representative was the

Honorable Frank E. Evans who is one of the most distinguished members of the House Armed Services Committee and in whose district the Air Force Academy is located.

Under the law, Mr. Speaker, this report is made directly to the President of the United States. However, I consider this document to be of such value that I want every Member of the Congress to have the benefit of its contents. I am sure all will agree that the contents of this report will stand as tribute to the Board and to its distinguished Chairman, Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, USAF, retired:

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The President,
The White House.

1. APPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD OF VISITORS

The Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy was appointed under the provisions of 10 USC 9355.

2. COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD

Appointed by the President

Three Years Effective 1964

Mr. Harold Cutliff Stuart, Former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

*Mr. Houston H. Harte, President, Express Publishing Company, San Antonio, Texas.

Three Years Effective 1965

Dr. Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., President, University of Virginia, Charlottsville, Virginia.

Dr. Robert V. Daniels, Chairman, History Department, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont.

Three Years Effective 1966

General Emmett O'Donnell, Jr., USAF (Retired), McLean, Virginia.

Reverend Joseph A. Flaherty, President, Villanova University, Villanova, Pennsylvania.

* Appointed in 1965 to fill an unexpired term.

Appointed by the Vice President

Senator Gordon L. Allott, Colorado.
Senator Gale W. McGee, Wyoming.
Senator Frank E. Moss, Utah.

Appointed by the Speaker of the House

Representative Robert J. Dole, First District, Kansas.

Representative John J. Flynt, Jr., Sixth District, Georgia.

Representative Melvin R. Laird, Seventh District, Wisconsin.

Representative Byron G. Rogers, First District, Colorado.

Ex officio members

Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator Richard B. Russell, Georgia.

Designee: Senator Stuart Symington, Missouri.

Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, Representative L. Mendel Rivers, First District, South Carolina.

Designee: Representative Frank E. Evans, Third District, Colorado.

3. CONVENING OF THE BOARD

The Board convened at 0800, 28 April 1966 and elected General Emmett O'Donnell, Jr., as its chairman. The Board completed its meetings at 1230 on 30 April 1966.

Those present were: General Emmett O'Donnell, Jr., USAF (Ret.); Dr Robert V. Daniels, Rev. Flaherty, Mr. Houston H. Harte, Dr. Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., Mr Harold C. Stuart, Senator Gordon L. Allott, Senator Frank E. Moss, Representative Robert J. Dole, Representative Frank E. Evans, Representative John J. Flynt, Jr., Representative Byron G. Rogers.

4. COMMENTS OF THE BOARD

Procedural considerations

The Board reiterates the recommendations of the 1965 Board that:

1. The leadership of the House of Representatives and the Senate assume responsibility for the appointments to the Board membership in the first month of each calendar year.

2. The President be informed of the importance of early selection of the Presidential appointees to the Board, which also should be announced by February 1st.

The breakfast meeting of the Board held in Washington, D.C., on 28 March at the invitation of the Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Harold Brown, was helpful in providing general information about the current programs of the Academy and saved valuable time during the meetings at Colorado Springs. This preliminary meeting also provided an opportunity for the Board members to become acquainted with each other and to discuss the agenda for the annual visitation.

Attendance at the Academy by all but three members of the Board at the regular meeting indicates that the early announcement of appointments and early notification of the time of meeting enabled a larger proportion of the members to be present than ever before. The Board recomemnds that the next annual meeting be scheduled for 27–29 April 1967.

The Board was pleased to find that the agenda provided more time for discussions with cadets and faculty members than was experienced in the past. It is recommended that next year, new members who are not acquainted with the Academy be invited to arrive one day in advance of the Board's scheduled meeting so that they may be provided appropriate general information and a tour of the facilities. It is further recommended that other members of the Board who represent colleges and universities be invited to arrive one day early so that they will have sufficient time to inquire in detail into areas of special interest to them. These recommendations are intended to make it feasible to conduct the meeting with a minimum of formal briefings and to provide more time for small forums and individual discussions with cadets, faculty and staff members, and for visits to classes in session. It is particularly desired that a half day be made available for informal conversations with cadets of all classes.

While it is impracticable to increase the length of the regular annual meeting for all members, it was agreed that the Board should spend more time at the Academy. It, therefore, is recommended that the current Board be invited to have a full meeting at the Academy later this year—tentatively on the 18th and 19th of November.

Previous recommendations

The Board reviewed the recommendations made by the previous Board and noted that much progress has been made toward the suggested objectives.

Academy expansion

The Board again endorses the programmed construction of facilities and the increase in the size of the Cadet Wing as authorized by Public Law 88–276, and recommends that the funds required to meet the program be authorized and appropriated. It is essential that the construction of facilities be kept in balance with the growth of the Cadet Wing. Any imbalance in these areas would create chaotic conditions. The Board was pleased to find that the program is thus far on schedule.

The Board again cautions the responsible officials to provide an inspection procedure to insure that no substandard construction of new facilities be accepted by the government. The Board again recommends that, if and when a program for construction of additional family housing for staff personnel is undertaken, every effort be made to utilize more ground space per unit than was originally provided. It appears that with so much space available, overcrowding can easily be avoided.

It was brought to the attention of the Board that as a result of the increase in the size of entering classes, the ratio of qualified candidates to appointment vacancies will drop significantly. This is not yet a serious problem but by 1968 could result in the entry of classes appreciably less qualified than the average of previous classes. Since the selection ratio depends largely upon the number of candidates nominated by Members of Congress, the current provisions of Title 10, United States Code which limit the number of nominations to six per vacancy is a significant limiting factor. To alleviate this situation, it is recommended that the Academy Superintendent present a proposal through appropriate channels for legislation to amend Title 10 so that the number of nominations authorized per vacancy be increased from six to ten.

Fulfillment of Academy mission

The Superintendent is eminently qualified for his duties. He gives wise leadership to his highly motivated faculty and staff. Their combined dedication, competence and vitality were abundantly apparent to the Board. There can be no question that the Academy is admirably fulfilling its stated mission which is, "To provide instruction, experience, and motivation to each cadet so that he will graduate with the knowledge, character, and qualities of leadership essential to his progressive development as a career officer in the United States Air Force." The Board was greatly impressed by the continuing attention to detail along these lines, the careful introduction of innovations, and the judicious balancing of academic programs—all leading to the fulfillment of the "whole man" concept which is the stated goal of the Academy.

Curriculum

Of the many outstanding aspects of the academic program, the Board was most favorably impressed by the coordination of instructional effort among departments which leads to integrated understanding and application of knowledge by the cadets. Also impressive is the extensive research being carried out by cadets in advanced courses. The Board commends the policy of making the most of individual cadet abilities and preparation through the Academic Enrichment Program which gives each cadet the opportunity to reach his own maximum level of achievement. Initially the program was uniquely successful because of the wholehearted cooperation of large numbers of qualified volunteer instructors who enthusiastically contributed time and effort to the project. Since then additional instructors have been authorized to cover the overload, and the program is now on a sound and businesslike basis. The academic majors-for-all program and cooperative master's degree program are logical developments of the enrichment program.

A significant proportion of the Board's time was spent attending classes and conferring with individual faculty members and departmental supervisors. The impressions so gained further support the conclusion of previous Boards that the Academy's academic accomplishments are at least equal to those of the best undergraduate colleges and universities in the United States.

The physical education program is recognized as a most important integral part of the Academy curriculum. The Board was pleased to find this program effectively designed and executed to meet the special needs of future Air Force officers.

The Board noted with approval that emphasis on the Graduation Order of Merit has been greatly reduced. It is understood that diplomas will no longer be awarded in a sequence determined by the GOM. Not more than seven percent of the class will be designated as Distinguished Cadets and awarded their diplomas in alphabetical order before the balance of the class who also will be called in alphabetical order.

Testing and grading

The Board made a special effort to probe testing and grading procedures in detail with the Dean and faculty members. The discussions included the general problem of measurement and evaluation of academic achievement as well as the specific policies, practices, and procedures at the Air Force Academy. The information received by the Board indicates that the current system is operating effectively and is generally in accordance with practices of the leading academic institutions in the country. Academic attrition has ranged from six to nine percent over the past four years. This low rate reflects the high quality of the entering classes and the joint effort of the cadets and faculty in the pursuit of academic excellence.

Honor code

The Board devoted considerable time to meetings with representatives of the Cadet Honor and Ethics Committees and was deeply impressed by their sense of responsibility and their deep belief in the precepts of the Cadet Honor Code. The entire Cadet Wing seems strongly committed to the Code as a personal code of ethics. The Board noted the judicious and constructive modifications of administrative procedures which have been made and recommends that efforts be continued to refine such procedures. Special emphasis should be given to efforts to insure understanding of the Code by entering cadets and their parents.

Instructional staff

The dual nature of the Academy's mission, that of both military and academic training, places heavy demands on the instructional staff. The Board finds that under the capable leadership of the Dean and the Commandant of Cadets the morale and quality of the instructors are remarkably high.

The reports of previous Boards of Visitors, of the Accreditation Team of the North Central Association, and of two ad hoc civilian academic advisory committees fully justify the rationale for the Air Force Academy of an all-military faculty academically qualified through graduate training and degrees. The Board endorses this position and considers such a faculty to be best equipped to meet the combined requirements of the Academy for professional and academic training. The second of the advisory committees, which included four prominent civilian educators, stated in its report of February 1964, "We conclude that an all-military faculty is much better suited to achieve the Academy's goal than is a mixed faculty. In this connection we thoroughly endorse the reasoning and conclusions contained in Section II of the Report of the 1962 Academic Advisory Committee." The 1962 Committee, which included fifteen educators from the fields of physical science, engineering, social science and humanities, devoted a third of its thirty-three page report to the faculty. The report noted the high level of professional knowledge and skill of the faculty members, their intense interest in their subjects, and their dedication to their teaching responsibilities. It was also noted that the advantages of a purely military faculty greatly outweigh the disadvantages.

The Board believes that this favorable situation should be maintained and possibly improved by a variety of Air Force actions such as:

1. Continue to give highest possible manning priority to the Air Force Academy, so that the faculty and military instructional personnel come from among the best qualified officers in the Air Force.

2. Maintain the master's degree as a minimum qualification for faculty membership.

3. Continue actions which lead to increasing the proportion of the faculty who have earned doctoral degrees.

4. Continue the effort to add stability to the faculty by appointing the authorized number of permanent professors and tenure associate professors as soon as practicable. Consideration should be given to increasing the authorized number as the Cadet Wing expands.

5. At the completion of a normal tour of faculty duty, identify the most successful teachers and assign them to Air Force duties related to their academic specialties. The names of those officers should be listed on a special roster with the thought of returning them to the Academy for a second tour of duty as vacancies occur.

6. Continue to take full advantage of manning priorities and select Air Officers Commanding from among officers who have the desire, experience, temperament, education, and training for this vital duty. Only one of these officers is assigned to each cadet squadron. It is essential that he be qualified to provide supervision, guidance, and counsel to cadets and cadet officers in every facet of cadet life, including leadership training and career motivation. This group should be representative of all Air Force commands with final selection being based upon personal interviews.

Fiscal affairs

The Superintendent and his staff are commended for their enviable success in the area of fiscal management. The Board was pleased to find that the Academy has annually exceeded its assigned goal since the inception of the Air Force Cost Reduction Program in Fiscal Year 1963.

The Board was pleased to note that the recent pay adjustment for military personnel provides a cadet pay rate which closely approximates the amount determined by the service academies as necessary to meet current expenses of cadets and midshipmen.

Flying training

The Board reiterates the Academy's need, voiced by several previous Boards, for at least a limited flying indoctrination program. Such training has a uniquely beneficial effect on cadet morale and provides valuable motivation toward an Air Force career. There is no question that a program should be established for the Academy, which is at least equal to the light aircraft pilot training provided for cadets in advanced Air Force ROTC. The Board endorses the program submitted by the Academy, which provides for management by the Air Training Command; training to be conducted at Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Pine Valley Airstrip on the Academy site, and Butts Army Air Field, Fort Carson; and contractor operated maintenance and supply support.

The Board inspected facilities and received appropriate briefings on existing flying, soaring, and parachute training presently being conducted at the Academy. In this regard, it recommends that steps be taken immediately to improve the associated existing facilities. In particular, the Pine Valley Airstrip should be hardened, and the facility should be provided with utilities, control and communication capability, and a parking area.

Overseas field studies

Overseas field studies provide cadets with broadening advantages and practical knowledge through contact with our allied Air Forces on their own bases in their own countries. While the Board understands and accepts the reasons for the temporary suspension of these field studies, it strongly endorses the reintroduction of this program as an integral part of the curriculum at the earliest possible date.

White Committee report

The response of the Academy to the recommendations of the Special Advisory Committee on the United States Air Force Academy (White Committee) was reviewed in detail by the Board. The Board noted the alacrity and positive nature of the Academy's reaction to most of these recommendations. Further, it noted and approved a delay in implementing a few of the recommendations pending completion of additional studies and analyses.

Advisory Council

The Board was informed of the functions of the newly constituted Air Force Academy Advisory Council. Its stated mission is to provide continuous, broad and penetrating advice to the Superintendent and his staff concerning policies, programs, and techniques for the education, motivation, and professional development of Air Force cadets. It is understood that this Advisory Council to the Superintendent will eliminate the necessity for ad hoc committees which in the past have been convened on a one-time basis to complete specific studies in depth of various aspects of the academic, military, and physical education programs.

Some Board members expressed concern in regard to the Advisory Council concept of operations. The charter and concept of operations afford unusually wide latitude to the Council. The Board suggests that care be taken in developing the mode of operation of the Council to avoid interference with the Superintendent's judgment and responsibility in making major decisions. Further in the opinion of the Board, the Council should carefully review its functions in order to delineate them clearly from the functions, duties, and responsibilities delegated by law to the Board of Visitors.

The Board also suggests that it would be highly desirable to have the Council's report of its yearly activities in the hands of the Superintendent in time for him to discuss it with the Board of Visitors at its annual meeting.

Football schedule

The Board is satisfied that every possible effort has been made to arrange appropriate football schedules for the Academy. Since major games usually are scheduled seven to nine years in advance, it is recognized that an optimum schedule is not always possible. The Academy has been successful in adjusting future schedules to alternate games with the Military Academy and the Naval Academy each year through 1971, and to compete with both each year thereafter. It was noted that the Navy game will be played at the Air Force Academy in 1966 and that the Army game will be played there in 1967.

5. CONCLUSION

The Board carefully studied the 1965 Report of the Board of Visitors and the Comments of the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of Defense to the recommendations of the 1965 Board of Visitors.

While these two documents covered a very difficult year at the Academy, none of the shortcomings mentioned by the Report of the 1965 Board seems to have done permanent damage. Corrective actions have been taken slowly and carefully with considerable success.

The Board was pleased to note these corrections but believes that unremitting attention must be exercised in order to prevent resurrection and recurrence of these flaws.

The Academy is a vital and dynamic organization. The air literally crackles with the boundless energy of twenty-five hundred young men who are being encouraged to develop initiative while submitting to disciplines far greater than those expected of ordinary citizens. Problems and troubles will inevitably occur and recur as the Academy expands and the rotation of individuals through the institution proceeds. The Superintendent and his staff must be capable of sensing and correcting these trends before they gather momentum if possible. This means full-time dedication to the job with a minimum of interference from outside.

The Board finds no area where urgent change is needed. The problem areas are locally recognized, long-range planning is flexible and sound, and the mission of the Academy is kept constantly in mind.

"Bring Me Men" is the motto over the main ramp at the Academy. Good men are being provided by the selection process and they are being trained physically, mentally, and spiritually to be qualified for leadership in the Air Force. The balance between intellectual development and leadership training is good. It is important that this delicate balance be maintained, allowing at no time one facet of this dual-development program to outweigh or overshadow the other.

The Academy is charged with the task of developing men who are fighting leaders. Men who have the ability and will to fight with their intellects as well as their brawn whenever necessary—men who wear their uniform and rank well—proudly, but with compassion, understanding, and a sense of humor—men who are strong, intelligent, and happy warriors with confidence in their weapons, themselves, and each other—and finally, men with good instincts, good appetites and good control of those appetites.

While these ideals may never be fully attained, the Board notes with great pleasure that the Academy is making extraordinary progress toward their achievement.

Respectfully submitted.

EMMETT O'DONNELL, Jr.,
General, USAF (Retired), Chairman,
1966 Board of Visitors.

Conference Report on H.R. 14324

SPEECH
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the conference report on the bill, H.R. 14324, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and other purposes, was considered by this body and agreed to. Under leave to extend my remarks I submit the following additional information to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On May 3, 1966, the Committee on Science and Astronautics brought to the floor of the House H.R. 14324, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act, 1967. The committee report which was filed with the bill recommended that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration be granted authorization for fiscal year 1967 in the amount of $4,986,864,150. The original request from NASA totaled $5,012 million. The committee recommendation was $25,135,850 less than the agency's request. On that date the House passed the bill as recommended by the committee. Following passage by the House, the Senate action on the bill resulted in total appropriations to be authorized of $5,008 million. This represented an increase over the House bill of $21,135,850. The Senate also struck all after the enacting clause, thus effecting a single amendment for consideration in conference. Consequently, the duly appointed members of the Committee of Conference embarked on a series of meetings to resolve the differences in the House and Senate versions.

The major monetary differences in the two versions occurred in the smaller elements of the authorization bill. In "Construction of facilities" the difference between the House and Senate was $6.1 million. In the "Administrative operations" section of the bill there was a difference of approximately $14.7 million. These two elements of the authorization request represent 15 percent of the total authorization bill.

For "Research and development," which constitutes 85 percent of the bill, there was only a difference of $365,000. However, within this section of the bill there were several major program issues involved, such as the Mariner-Venus and Mariner-Mars programs, the 260-inch solid propellant booster and SNAP–8 projects, which caused considerable debate between the conferees appointed by the two Houses. Under House parliamentary rule the managers on the part of the House are bound in conference between upper and lower limits of not only the total amount authorized but also the upper and lower limits of the individual projects or programs comprising the total contained in the authorization bill.

I am pleased to inform the House that the conferees arrived at an agreement on the various projects and programs in dispute and returned to their respective chambers with a revised authorization bill amounting to $5,000,419,000. This total is broken down into $4,248,600,000 for research and development, $94,919,000 for construction of facilities, and $655,900,000 for administrative operations. Thus, the conference action has resulted in a revised fiscal year 1967 authorization bill that is aproximately $11.5 million less than the NASA request and about $13.6 million more than the originally passed House version.

I would now like to review briefly the major programs and projects which were in dispute during the conference and the final resolution agreed to by the conferees.

First, for the total to be authorized for research and development, the NASA requested $4,246,600,000. The House increased the amount to be authorized to $4,248,235,000. The Senate action on the bill resulted in an authorization of $4,248,600,000, a difference of $365,000. The conferees agreed to a total to be authorized for research and development of $4,248,600,000, by effecting adjustments to the Senate amendment as follows:

In the physics and astronomy program, NASA had requested a total of $131,400,000. The House reduced this amount by $4.5 million, representing reductions of $3 million in supporting research and technology and advanced studies and $1.5 million in the orbiting astronomical observatory project. The Senate restored the full amount of the House reduction.

The House reduction of $3 million in supporting research and technology was made in order to make available additional funds for the unmanned exploration of Mars. During the conference the managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the Senate restoration of $3 million in this project, since subsequent to the passage of the House version, information had been received from NASA that, due to the passage of time, one of the purposes for which these funds had been redesignated could not be accomplished, specifically the incorporation of an instrumented probe in the 1969 Mariner-Mars spacecraft.

The House reduction of $1.5 million in the orbiting astronomical observatory project, an amount specifically earmarked for the development of the fifth spacecraft, was based on the fact that there is no overriding urgency in pursuing this mission. The Senate receded from their position that this amount be restored and agreed to the House position that the fifth orbiting astronomical observatory spacecraft be deferred.

For the lunar and planetary program, NASA's request for fiscal year 1967 totalled $197,900,000. The House increased this request by a net amount of $30 million, of which $22 million was specifically designated for the Voyager project. The House also eliminated the 1967 Mariner-Venus mission on the grounds that it had been hastily conceived and represented a solitary effort unaccompanied by any plans for later missions. The $12 million thus derived from the cancellation of the 1967 Venus mission along with an additional $8 million were added to the Mariner-Mars program and specifically designated for the initiation of development of an instrumented probe to be incorporated in the 1969 Mariner-Mars spacecraft for the purpose of making direct measurements in the Martian atmosphere.

The Senate denied all House adjustments to the lunar and planetary program, restoring all projects to the original NASA request.

In conference, the managers on the part of the House receded from their position on the 1967 Venus mission basically because it was learned subsequent to the House passage of the bill that NASA had already proceeded with the development of the spacecraft using prior years' appropriations and that a substantial investment has already been made, most of which would be unrecoverable in the event this project was cancelled.

The House also receded from its position with regard to the addition of the instrumented probe for the Mariner-Mars spacecraft. This action on the part of the House conferees was predicated upon the fact that due to the passage of time the purpose for which these funds had been added cannot be accomplished.

With regard to the Voyager project, the Senate receded from their position and agreed to the addition of $13 million for preliminary work on the Voyager program. Thus, the total amount agreed to in conference for the lunar and planetary program is $210,900,000.

For the bioscience program NASA requested $35,400,000 which included $14.7 million for supporting research and technology. The House reduced this amount by $2 million in order to make available additional funds for the unmanned exploration of Mars. The Senate restored the full amount. The managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the restoration of these funds since the Mariner-Mars project had been restored to the original NASA request by previous conference agreement.

NASA requested a total of $152 million for the launch vehicle procurement program. The House reduced this amount by $20 million by effecting cuts in the request as follows: $10 million across-the-board reduction was made in view of substantial unobligated fund carryovers from previous years; a $6 million reduction, representing the amount for the purchase of an Atlas-Agena launch vehicle for the 1967 Mariner-Venus mission; and a reduction of $4 million for sustaining engineering and maintenance associated with the Centaur launch vehicle.

The Senate restored the entire $20 million House reduction, however, in conference receded from their position and agreed upon an across-the-board reduction of $5.25 million, and the $4 million reduction in the Centaur sustaining engineering and maintenance fund request proposed by the House. The managers on the part of the House receded from their position and agreed to the restoration of $6 million for the purchase of the Atlas-Agena launch vehicle to be used in the 1967 Venus mission which had previously been agreed to by the conference committee. Thus, the total amount authorized for launch vehicle procurement is $142,750,000.

NASA requested $42,500,000 for space power and electrical propulsion systems. The House bill increased this amount by $2.4 million which was specifically earmarked for an increased component testing program for the SNAP-8 nuclear electric generator. The Senate bill denied this increase. However, the managers on the part of the Senate finally agreed to an increase of $2 million for this project. The final authorization for space propulsion and electrical power systems is $44,500,000.

For chemical propulsion research, NASA originally requested $37 million. That amount included $3.5 million for continued development of the 260-inch solid propellant booster. The House version provided an increase of $7.5 million for the project, making a total available for fiscal year 1967 of $11 million which, in the opinion of the House, would speed the development and would provide for a full-length firing rather than a one-half length firing proposed by NASA.

The Senate amendment denied this increase and agreed with NASA's request. Although our limited propulsion capability has been a major factor in the progress of our Nation's space program to date and although solid propulsion technology could provide a safer, more versatile, and more economical booster than others under development, the managers on the part of the Senate did not agree to the increased funding authorized by the House.

A compromise position was finally agreed upon, which provides an additional $4 million for this project in fiscal year 1967. While, in the opinion of the House, this is insufficient it will at least allow NASA to initiate procurement of long-lead time items, such as the nozzle, the steel case and facility modifications so that a full-length firing can be conducted within approximately 18 months. Thus, the total authorized as a result of the conference committee action for chemical propulsion is $41 million.

NASA requested $279,300,000 for tracking and data acquisition. The House bill reduced this amount by $13,965,000. The Senate amendment restored the full amount. The Senate receded from their position and the conferees agreed to a net reduction to the NASA request of $8,450,000. The total amount authorized for tracking and data acquisition is $270,850,000.

The NASA request for technology utilization was $4,800,000. The House bill increased this amount by $200,000 to provide a limited increased flow of new technology to the private sector of our industry, particularly to small business. The Senate amendment denied this increase. The managers on the part of the Senate receded and agreed to the increase proposed by the House, thus authorizing a total of $5 million for this program.

For "Construction of facilities," the NASA requested $101,500,000 for fiscal year 1967. The House approved $94,419,000. The Senate restored $6,081,000 authorizing a total of $100,500,000. In conference the Senate receded and agreed to a total amount of $95,919,000 to be authorized. There were four projects involved in the "Construction of facilities" segment of the bill which were in dispute during the conference.

The first of these had to do with the NASA request for $10 million for the Electronic Research Center to construct two buildings and to provide additional center support facilities. The House reduced the request to $5 million, since authorizations granted in the two preceding fiscal years have not yet been obligated. The Senate restored the fiscal year 1967 request in full. In consideration of the limited progress made to date in site acquisition the managers on the part of the Senate agreed to a total of $7.5 million which will permit NASA to proceed with an integral construction unit during fiscal year 1967.

For the Manned Spacecraft Center, NASA requested $13,800,000, which included $9.1 million for a Lunar Receiving Laboratory. The House approved this project. However, the Senate reduced it by $1 million. The managers on the part of the House receded to the Senate position authorizing a total for the Manned Spacecraft Center of $12,800,000.

NASA requested $581,000 for the Marshall Space Flight Center to construct an addition to the new Hazardous Operations Laboratory. The House deleted this item due to the fact that in their opinion the proposed extension of the laboratory was not needed to support on-going programs. The Senate restored the item; however, in conference the Senate managers receded to the House position, deleting the entire amount of $581,000.

For "Facility planning and design," NASA requested $7 million for fiscal year 1967. The House reduced this amount by $1.5 million in view of the remaining unfunded balances from prior years' authorization for this type of work. The Senate restored the full authorization request, but in conference the Senate managers receded to the House position. Thus, the total amount authorized for "Facility planning and design" is $5,500,000.

For "Administrative operations," NASA requested a total of $663,900,000 for fiscal year 1967. The House reduced the NASA request by $19,689,850, approving a total of $644,210,150. The Senate restored $14,698,850 and passed a total authorization for "Administrative operations" of $658,900,000.

The Senate version of the bill also includes restrictive language which, in the opinion of the managers on the part of the House, would greatly curtail the flexibility now afforded to the Administrator to the extent that the Nation's space effort would be seriously handicapped. The restrictions imposed by the Senate language would have divided the total authorized for "Administrative operations" into two categories—"Personnel compensation and benefits" and "Other expenses." Further restrictions were imposed which would limit the extent of transfer authority into the former account to 1 percent of the total authorized for that purpose and would limit the extent of transfer authority into the latter account to 10 percent of the total authorized for other expenses. The Senate language also struck from section 4 the authority to transfer funds into the "Administrative operations" account.

These restrictions were so limiting as to place NASA in a position of not even being able to meet any Federal pay increases which might be subsequently enacted.

The managers on the part of the Senate receded and agreed to strike all restrictive language and further receded to a net reduction of $8 million to the NASA request, resulting in a total amount for "Administrative operations" of $655,900,000.

As part of its original request NASA included a new section 5 in the bill which would grant the Administrator relief from the 6-percent limitation on architect-engineer fees imposed by the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 2306(d). NASA's proposal had been to amend the basic Space Act of 1958, thereby enacting permanent legislation which would permit waivers of the 6-percent limitation by the Administrator. The House disagreed with NASA's request in this regard and included a substitute provision which would grant relief to NASA for a period of 1 year only. The provision of temporary relief was based on the House position that all Federal agencies involved in the construction of facilities, particularly in support of research and development programs are faced with the same problem regarding the limitations on architect-engineer fees. The House report accompanying H.R. 14324 instructed the Comptroller General to conduct a Government-wide study with regard to this matter and to submit its recommendations for possible legislative change by January 1, 1967.

The Senate disagreed with the House position in this matter and deleted section 5 from the bill on the basis that NASA should abide by the same procurement practices in effect within the Department of Defense. The Senate agreed with the House that a Government-wide study should be made, however, their position was that the Bureau of the Budget should conduct this study in lieu of the Comptroller General as proposed by the House.

In conference the managers on the part of the House agreed with the Senate that the provision should be struck from the bill and that NASA should be enjoined to abide by the procurement regulations in effect within the Department of Defense pending possible revision to the statutes. The Senate, on the other hand, receded to the House position and agreed that the Government-wide study should be made by the Comptroller General.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing account of the actions taken in conference has been somewhat in detail as, in my opinion, it should be, in view of the fact that it involves authorization amounting to more than $5 billion. As in all conferences of this nature some compromise is necessary. However, in my opinion, the items in dispute have been settled in conference more in favor of the original House position than the position assumed by the Senate.

I feel that our conferees have adequately defended the House position and prevailed in most major issues involving the national space effort. The bill as finally agreed to in conference is the best possible that we could achieve under the circumstances. It is a bill which, in my opinion, is in the best interests of NASA and the furtherance of the Nation's space program.

The Family St. Onge Cited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, St. Michael's College, of Winooski, Vt., paid a unique honor to our colleague and friend, William St. Onge, of Connecticut's Second Congressional District, and to two members of his family, Mother Rita de la Croix, F.S.E., his sister, and the Right Reverend Monsignor Paul Jean St. Onge, his brother. All three were awarded honorary doctorate degrees by the college in recognition of their outstanding contributions to their communities, their country and their God.

Our colleague, Representative St. Onge, has had a distinguished career in State, local and National government. As a Member of the House of Representatives he has been a vigorous and enlightened advocate of education and human rights. He is a decorated flight engineer having served in World War II. He has served as State representative, prosecuting attorney and as mayor of Putnam, Conn., before entering the House of Representatives in 1962.

His sister, Mother Rita de la Croix, is superior of the American Province of the Daughters of the Holy Ghost. This gifted lady is director of 45 houses that stretch from the east to the west coast and to Canada. She has been involved in mission work and was at one time a prisoner in occupied France.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Paul St. Onge, is vicar general of the Diocese of Norwich. He has had an important role in church leadership and typifies the new image of enlightened, forward-looking church leadership.

It is not often that we see such an illustrious family, one which gives concrete meaning to the word excellence. The St. Onge's have not only given life to excellence, they have made it their hallmark.

President Kennedy, whose own family also epitomizes this excellence, once said:

> Happiness is the exercise of vital powers along lines of excellence in a life according them scope.

By this definition, the St. Onge's should be truly happy people.

I pay tribute to the remarkable achievements of my colleague and friend, and to his family, to his sense of honor, and to the honor he brings as a Member of the House. I also salute his parents whose guidance and inspiration have made this possible. I am sure my colleagues join me in extending to the entire family the heartiest of congratulations:

CITATION ACCOMPANYING HONORARY DEGREES, ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE, WINOOSIC, VT.

MOTHER RITA DE LA CROIX, F.S.E., THE HONORABLE WILLIAM LEON ST. ONGE, RIGHT REVEREND MONSIGNOR PAUL JEAN ST. ONGE

"For God and Country" is a motto dear to Americans. Never has it been better illustrated than in the family of St. Onge.

Like Dr. Dumont and "Dr." Mulder, they edify us with the image of unity.

If Drs. Dumont and Mulder testify to the one-world of Western culture as they knit Europe and America into one Christian community, the St. Onges, originally of Quebec, evidence that "hands across the border" cooperation which has levelled the barriers between Canada and the United States.

Descended from a French Pioneer family settled in New France before the Pilgrims and landed on Plymouth Rock, the St. Onges have been builders for Church and State since their establishment in Connecticut. Together they remind us of the achievements of another illustrious American Family—the Healys of Georgia, who, overcoming the handicaps of Negro origin, gave us a President of Holy Cross, a Bishop of Portland, and a Mother Superior of Villa Barlow Convent in St. Albans.

Mother Rita de la Croix (whose imprisonment in Occupied France reads like a novel) is presently Superior of the American Province of the Daughters of the Holy Ghost. She has done graduate work at St. Mary's College, Indiana. She has been Mistress of Novices at her Order's Novitiate in Putnam. She has represented her American Sisters at the Motherhouse in France. She has opened missions in Chile. . . . Today she is director of forty-five houses in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, New York, California and Canada. . . . We are especially happy (and grateful) to add that two Home Missions under her charge are in Alabama, at Anniston and Gadsden where all Edmundites acknowledge her as architect of a truly "Good Neighbor" policy.

Brother William to her—and Congressman William St. Onge to us—is now serving his second term in the United States House of Representatives, admired universally for the vigor and enlightenment of his advocacy, especially in the field of education and human rights. Like his sister, he seems to have discovered the secret of perpetual motion-and-achievement. A decorated Flight Engineer in World War II, he has been successively, and successfully, State Representative, Prosecuting Attorney, Mayor of Putnam, Connecticut, and as United States Congressman, member of the House Judiciary Committee. . . . We are both honored and amazed that he found the time to grace this occasion today with his presence.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Paul St. Onge, Vicar General of the Diocese of Norwich, may be the youngest of the trio, but we can best describe him as a spreading branch of a noble family tree. . . . After studies in Brittany, interrupted by the outbreak of the War, he returned to finish his Theology at St. Mary's in Baltimore. Ordained in Hartford in 1941, he has been successively assistant pastor, chancellor, Director of the Propagation of the Faith, and now—Vicar General of the Diocese of Norwich. . . . We salute him as symbolic of the new image of Church leadership: youthful, dynamic, progressive.

Therefore, to the family of St. Onge, exemplars of community service, Saint Michael's College pays its tribute of triple investment in honorary doctorate to Mother Rita de la Croix, the Doctorate of Humane Letters; to the Honorable William Leon the Doctorate of Laws; to Right Reverend Monsignor Paul Jean the Doctorate of Laws.

[From the Putnam (Conn.) Windham County Observer—Putnam Patriot, June 8, 1966]

HONORARY DEGREES FOR THREE IN FAMILY

St. Michael's College of Winooski, Vt., awarded honorary degrees Monday to three members of the St. Onge family of Putnam.

Mother Rita de la Croix, superior of the American Province of the Daughters of the Holy Ghost at Putnam, was awarded a Doctor of Humane Letters Degree.

Her brothers were presented Doctor of Law Degrees. They are Representative William L. St. Onge, and the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Paul J. St. Onge, vicar general of the Norwich Diocese.

The presentations were made by the Very Rev. Jeremiah T. Purtill, a trustee and former vice president of the Roman Catholic college.

The mother of the recipients, Mrs. Alma Desautels St. Onge, was present at the ceremonies. She was cited by the commencement speaker, Bernard Auer, publisher of Time, and the Most Rev. Robert F. Joyce.

The citation accompanying honorary degrees conferred on Mother Rita de la Croix, FSE, the Honorable William L. St. Onge, and Right Rev. Monsignor Paul J. St. Onge.

"For God and Country" is a motto dear to Americans. Never has it been better illustrated than in the family of St. Onge. They edify us with the image of unity. The St. Onges, originally of Quebec, evidence that "hands across the border" cooperation which has levelled the barriers between Canada and the United States.

Descended from a French Pioneer family settled in New France before the Pilgrims had landed on Plymouth Rock, the St. Onges have been builders for Church and State since their establishment in Connecticut. Together they remind us of the achievements of another illustrious American Family—the Healys of Georgia, who, overcoming the handicaps of Negro origin, gave us a President of Holy Cross, a Bishop of Portland and a Mother Superior of Villa Barlow Convent in St. Albans.

Mother Rita de la Croix (whose imprisonment in Occupied France reads like a novel) is presently Superior of the American Province of the Daughters of the Holy Ghost. She has done graduate work at St. Mary's College, Indiana. She has been Mistress of Novices at her Order's Novitiate in Putnam. She has represented her American Sisters at the Motherhouse in France. She has opened Missions in Chile. Today she is director of forty-five houses in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, New York, California and Canada. We are especially happy (and grateful) to add that two Home Missions under her charge in Alabama, at Anniston and Gadsden where all Edmundites acknowledge her as architect of a truly "Good Neighbor" policy.

Brother WILLIAM to her—and Congressman WILLIAM ST. ONGE to us—is now serving his second term in the United States House of Representatives, admired universally for the vigor and enlightenment of his advocacy, especially in the field of education and human rights. Like his sister, he seems to have discovered the secret of perpetual motion and achievement. A decorated flight engineer in World War II, he has been successively, and successfully, State Representative, Prosecuting Attorney, Mayor of Putnam, Conn., and as U.S. Congressman, member of the House Judiciary Committee. We are both honored and amazed that he found time to grace this occasion today with his presence.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Paul St. Onge, Vicar General of the Diocese of Norwich, may be the youngest of the trio, but we can best describe him as a spreading branch of a noble family tree. After studies in Brittany, interrupted by the outbreak of the War, he returned to finish his Theology at St. Mary's in Baltimore. Ordained in Hartford in 1941, he has been successfully assistant pastor, chancellor, Director of the Propagation of the Faith, and now, Vicar General of the Diocese of Norwich. We salute him as symbolic of the new image of Church leadership: youthful, dynamic, progressive.

Therefore, to the family of St. Onge, exemplars of community service, Saint Michael's College pays its tribute of triple investment in honorary doctorate.

To Mother Rita de la Croix the Doctorate of Humane Letters.

To the Honorable WILLIAM LEON the Doctorate of Laws.

To Right Reverend Monsignor Paul Jean the Doctorate of Laws.

The three were presented for the degrees by the Very Rev. Jeremiah T. Purtill, SSE, Religious Superior at St. Edmund's Novitiate, Mystic, Conn., and former vice president of St. Michael's College and college trustee.

[From the Catholic Transcript, May 6, 1966]

ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE HONORS THREE OF ST. ONGE FAMILY

WINOOSKI PARK, VT.—Three members of the St. Onge family from Putnam, Conn., will receive honorary doctorates at the 63rd commencement of St. Michael's College here on Monday, June 6, it has been announced.

Those to be honored are: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Paul J. St. Onge, vicar general of the Diocese of Norwich; his sister, Mother Rita de la Croix, F.S.E., provincial superior of the American Province of the Daughters of the Holy Ghost; and his brother Congressman WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, U.S. Representative from Connecticut's Second District.

Msgr. St. Onge and Congressman ST. ONGE will receive the degree of Doctor of Laws. Mother Rita de la Croix will receive the degree of Doctor of Humane Letters.

All three are natives of Putnam.

Monsignor St. Onge, administrator of St. Joseph's Church, New London, as well as vicar general of the diocese since 1962, was ordained in 1941.

He served as assistant at Sacred Heart, Taftville, and at St. Mary's, Jewett City, before appointed chancellor of the Norwich diocese in 1953. He has also served as diocesan director of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. He was appointed a domestic prelate by Pope Pius XII in 1958, and was named a diocesan consultor the same year.

Mother Rita de la Croix has been provincial of the Daughters of the Holy Ghost since 1962. She made her profession in the congregation in 1938, in France, and later studied and taught there. During World War II she was interned for 18 months in Alsace Lorraine.

Returning to the United States in 1944, Mother Rita de la Croix served as assistant mistress of postulants at the motherhouse in Putnam, then as councillor at the general motherhouse in France. From 1953–1962 she was mistress of novices in Putnam, and in 1962 was named provincial superior.

The expansion of Annhurst College, South Woodstock, and the inauguration of the congregation's first foreign mission in Chile are among the projects carried out during her administration.

Congressman ST. ONGE, a veteran of World War II, is a former member of the Putnam Board of Education and the state legislature. He has also served as probate judge in Putnam, prosecuting attorney in that city, judge of the City Court, and chairman of the Putnam Housing Authority. Later he was director and vice president of the Connecticut Urban Renewal Association. He was elected to Congress in 1964.

A brother of the three honorary degree recipients, Rev. Theodore E. St. Onge, is pastor of St. Mary's Church, Baltic. Their mother, Mrs. Alma St. Onge, is a member of St. Mary's Parish, Putnam.

COMMUNISM IS FAILING, SMC COMMENCEMENT GATHERING TOLD

(By Ed Myers)

The publisher of Time magazine told the graduating class at St. Michael's College Monday he is optimistic about the year 2000—when the "confronted generation" will be middle-aged—partly because the United States and Russia have begun "to live with one another."

Bernhard M. Auer, speaker at SMC's 63rd commencement, attributed this "undeclared truce" to the "very cold truth that communism is simply not working," rather than to the threat to Russia from Red China or the fear of mutual destruction.

"It (communism) has failed miserably to produce a standard of living and a humane political atmosphere that could compete with the example of the West—particularly the example of Western Europe reborn," Auer told the graduates.

Auer declared that Khrushchev had admitted genuine Communist failures in recognizing that "creature comforts had to be passed on to consumers" and in easing political repression at home to lessen Cold War pressures against the West.

He went on to cite other Communist setbacks but warned of the continuing threat of Communist expansion and subversion in the uneasy states of Africa and Southeast Asia.

He asserted as more people are exposed to the internal weaknesses behind the Iron Curtain, "the inherent flabbiness of the Communist social and political philosophy, more people will reject it."

A realization is required today, he continued, that when the newly independent nations move quite naturally away from the West they are not necessarily moving toward the East.

"Now that's a fact of life which just 10 years ago would have been quite unacceptable in America," he commented.

Auer, one of nine to receive honorary doctorates at the commencement, spoke in Ethan Allen Gym at the abandoned Air Force base adjacent to the college proper, as a muggy atmosphere threatened the rain that held off until afternoon.

The Time publisher said he had cast aside as a topic for his talk the Normandy invasion of June 6, 1944, because it might hit the graduates "with all the impact of a jazz concert featuring Guy Lombardo."

He hesitated before beginning his address long enough to ask the audience to salute a woman who had no direct part in the ceremony, Mrs. Alma St. Onge of Putnam, Conn., the mother of a nun, a priest and a Congressman who all received honorary doctorates in a joint conferral.

In many ways the 63rd commencement at St. Michael's was like any other—the pomp and color, slightly rumpled but jubilant graduates posing with relatives after the ceremony for the camera-laden spectators who always seem to outnumber the graduates.

But there were the small events that make every commencement different and unique, especially for those ending a four-year way of life—like a simple announcement by Lt. Col. Charles Ruggiero Jr., as he began the Air Force commissioning ceremony that the Gemini astronauts had splashed down safety.

There was the sobering remembrance as 21 young men became Air Force officers and gentlemen that only 22 years before to the day other young men had swarmed ashore on the beaches of France.

For the graduates there was the seemingly short march into the gym and, after the ceremony, the much longer walk from college into the world.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, June 7, 1966]

COLLEGE HONORS ST. ONGE FAMILY

WINOOSKI, VT.—Three members of the St. Onge family of Putnam, Conn.—a sister superior, a monsignor and a congressman—were given honorary degrees today at St. Michael's College.

The degrees were presented by the Very Rev. Jeremiah T. Purtill, a trustee and former vice president of the Roman Catholic College. He is now superior of St. Edmund's Novitiate in Mystic, Conn.

Father Purtill presented a doctor of humane letters degree to Mother Rita de la Croix, superior of the American Province of the Daughters of the Holy Ghost at Putnam.

Her brothers, Rep. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, D-Conn., and the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Paul J. St. Onge, vicar general of the Norwich, Conn., diocese, received honorary doctor of laws degrees.

The three recipients are the children of William A. and Alma Desautels St. Onge, originally from Quebec.

Their mother was at the ceremonies and was cited by the commencement speaker, Bernard Auer, publisher of Time, and the most Rev. Robert F. Joyce, bishop of Burlington.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Family Fun in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, summertime fun and vacation pleasure are abundantly available in West Virginia. Those whose family vacation plans are not yet complete will welcome the suggestions carried by the July 10, 1966, edition of the Sunday Gazette-Mail State magazine, Charleston, W. Va., in the article entitled "Family Fun in West Virginia," written by Mary Cobb.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMILY FUN IN WEST VIRGINIA: USING BLUESTONE STATE PARK AS A BASE CAMP, THERE'S FASCINATING TOURING IN ANY DIRECTION

(By Mary Cobb)

Looking for a nearby summer vacation spot that will satisfy every member of your family and still fit your pocketbook? Then take a state map and draw a line from Bluefield to White Sulphur Springs to Beckley and back down to Bluefield—and there's your answer. This lopsided triangle of land offers you mountain trails, water sports and unusual sightseeing.

In the middle of the triangle is Bluestone State Park, your vacation base, where the lush Allegheny Mountains rise from the lake like so many prehistoric animals sunning themselves.

Deluxe cabins, accommodating two to six people are $50, $80 or $100 per week; the state's Department of Natural Resources makes reservations. Trailer and tent sites are available on a first-come basis, $1.50 per night for a party of six and 25 cents for each additional camper. Close by are tables, charcoal grills, firewood, water and a central washhouse. If you want to eat out, the park's restaurant overlooks a picturesque section of the 1,800-acre lake.

Bluestone is a paradise for those who like their vacation on water. Rowboats, motor boats and skiing equipment are for rent at the Park's two docks. Private boats and motors may be used on the lake without charge.

Fishermen can buy live bait, tackle and license (a six-day tourist license is three dollars) at the docks and then test their skill against bluegill, bass, crappie and catfish.

There is no charge for fishing in the lake but state laws are enforced.

Near one of the boat docks are fenced swimming and wading pools, a picnic area and playground. Shuffleboard, croquet, badminton, volleyball and horseshoes are available, and the game equipment can be rented hourly. Bluestone cabin guests may use the golfing facilities at the Willow Wood Country Club, about 14 miles from the park. Also, the park has a recreation room where visitors may get acquainted, and a naturalist is employed to take guests on hikes and nature studies in the mountains.

For those who enjoy sightseeing, this odd-shaped triangle is overflowing with natural beauty and uncommon things to see, all at minimum cost.

An hour's ride to Beckley takes you on W. Va. 3, a suspended mountain road that looks down on colorful apple orchards in the valleys below. In Grandview State Park outside Beckley you can watch the struggle of West Virginia's birth in an unparalleled setting of great rhododendron and stars. Dr. Kermit Hunter's widely-acclaimed play, "Honey in the Rock," is performed nightly except Mondays in the 1,300-seat Cliffside Amphitheatre.

A trip to Beckley's Exhibition Coal Mine will be educational for the whole family. You'll get a lesson in the history of mining as you ride through 900 feet of damp, underground passageways in remade coal cars.

If you want to learn more about mining and mining camp life you can travel to Stotesbury, 15 miles from Beckley on W. Va. 16. This community has turned the house that was once the superintendent's into a ten-room Coal Town Museum. Here visitors will get a complete picture of the life of a miner and his family.

A drive of about an hour and a half on W. Va. 20 and U.S. 52 will take you from Bluestone to Bluefield, "Nature's Air-Conditioned City." If the temperature rises above 90 degrees, you'll receive free lemonade—compliments of the Chamber of Commerce!

On top of Bluefield's East River Mountain is the Mountain Crafts Shop where West Virginia's economy is getting a boost through the selling of exquisite, native handicrafted items. Woodcraft, needlework, weaving, handblown glass, jewelry, china and metal pieces brought approximately $9,000 to local people for their work last year.

Across the road from the shop is a delightful attraction, the brightly-colored Ridge Runner Railroad. This C. P. Huntington 1863 miniature train carries its 42 passengers along the mountain peak at an attitude of over 3,400 feet, providing breathtaking views of Bluefield and the cloud-shrouded Southern Appalachian Mountain chain. Because the Ridge Runner crisscrosses the West Virginia and Virginia borders four times in its mile-long run, it has the reputation of being "the world's shortest interstate railroad."

Your family will enjoy visiting one of the many mineral springs around Bluestone—Red Sulphur, Salt Sulphur, Pence, Blue Sulphur (birthplace of Traveller, Gen. Robert E. Lee's famous horse), Green Sulphur and White Sulphur (tours are conducted daily through the 6,500-acre estate of the internationally-famous Greenbrier Hotel where the springs are found). Lavish health resorts were built over a century ago near some of these mineral springs. Here the older folk sipped sulphur water and exchanged talk about their ailments while the younger folk joined the gay social whirl at the spa.

On W. Va. 3, two miles from Union, you'll find the Rehobeth Church, oldest Methodist church building west of the Alleghenies. Protected now by a huge tin awning, this slumbering little church was built in 1785 when Edward Keenan donated five acres for "as long as grass grows and water flows." It was around this church that some of the most fierce fighting between the Indians and early settlers took place, making it necessary for the men to carry their guns to church with them.

The family spelunker can follow W. Va. 3 and U.S. 219 to Organ Cave. The cave's limestone columns are formed like pipes of an organ and when struck by stones emit musical strains. Perhaps the rest of the family would like to go along for a picnic in the breeze-riffled meadow beside the meandering stream outside the cave.

At the Federal Fish Hatchery in White Sulphur (an hour and a half from Bluestone on W. Va. 3, U. S. 219 and U. S. 60) you can see West Virginia's celebrated Golden Trout. There's also brook, rainbow and brown trout, bluegills, and bass in every stage of development. For stocking purposes, the hatchery produces annually 110,000 yearling trout, 40,000 fingerling trout, and 120,000 largemouth bass and bluegills. At feeding time the children will have fun watching the fish tamely follow them around the tanks looking for a handout.

Near the hatchery is a modern six-room home built from blocks of cannel coal by Tip Myles in 1959. Later Myles built a crafts shop from the same material. His speciality is coal jewelry designed by his family. These pieces make unusual gifts for out-of-state friends if you want to do some Christmas shopping on your vacation.

Another day trip will take you to Lewisburg, real farm country, where the corn fields look as if they'd been laid out with a tape measure. Located here is the 3,500-acre Morlunda Farms, home of many prize-winning polled Hereford cattle. Visitors are welcome and your whole family will enjoy seeing this beautiful farm and some of the world's finest cattle.

At the General Lewis Motor Inn, the antique buffs in the family can take a trip down Memory Hall, long hallways lined with antiques. The public rooms and gardens of this aristocratic old inn, originally built in 1798, are open daily to tourists. Your little girls will love the garden playhouse which holds a collection of dolls and miniature furniture.

A pleasant walk takes you to the carefully manicured grounds of the eight-room Daywood Art Gallery. Paintings and etchings by nationally recognized artists of the 1800's and early 1900's are hung home-like above priceless English and American antique furniture. A charming second-floor bedroom obviously decorated with a little girl in mind will hold the eye of all the women in the family from 3 to 93.

Lewisburg's Old Stone Church, built by Presbyterian settlers in 1796, is the town's most cherished landmark. Years of devoted care have kept this box-shaped, green-shuttered building in excellent condition. It's the oldest church unrestored and in continuous use west of the Alleghenies.

The original long-handled collection boxes and the last Confederate offering received in April 1865, are still in the yestibule. Above the steep, maroon-carpeted stairway is the slave balcony looking down on ramrod pews facing a simple, lovely altar.

Fishing, hiking, swimming and resting in Bluestone State Park plus low-cost, unusual sightseeing in this ruggedly beautiful Southern section of the state will insure every member of your family an enjoyable vacation—one they'll even want to repeat!

Dentistry and the New Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

DENTISTRY AND THE NEW REVOLUTION

(By Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, Connecticut State Dental Association, Bridgeport, Conn., May 19, 1966)

Let me say, first of all, how pleased I am to be here with you at this annual Fones Award luncheon. Pleased for three reasons. The first is that the heritage and history of Connecticut and my state are so similar, so interwoven that being here is almost as nice as being home. Secondly, it gives me the first opportunity I have had personally to commend you for the far-sighted action taken last year when your General Assembly adopted fluoridation for all towns and cities of more than 20,000 people. Rhode Island, as you know, has long taken great pride in the leadership it has exercised in the field of public health generally and fluoridation in particular; some 85 per cent of my state's population is now drinking fluoridated water. In Connecticut, I understand, the history of fluoridation dates back more than 20 years and today about 30 per cent of your population is benefitting from this exceptional public health measure. That percentage will rise sharply as this new law comes into effect and you can all take great pride in looking forward to the many benefits that will flow from its enactment.

The third reasons I am glad to be here, naturally, is because of the high honor you are paying me with the bestowal of the Fones Award. This is, I believe, the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Award. And when I note that among my predecessors in receiving it are such men as Gerry Timmons and Harold Hillenbrand, I am doubly honored. No matter how long a career in public life a man is privileged to have, recognition of what he has been trying to say and do is always welcome. This Award has meaning, however, even beyond that because of the deep feeling I have for dentistry and the respect I have for the farshighted, public spirited attitude the leaders of your profession have consistently displayed in Washington. I am most proud of the part I have played in helping dentistry to gain and secure its proper place in the health field and this Award intensifies that pride. I thank you for it.

Over the past few weeks, while carrying out my normal duties, I have been giving considerable thought to planning the substance of what I wanted to say to you today. It would have been simple enough to put together a mere laundry list of the actions taken by the 89th Congress last year and during this current Session. It has been a remarkable Congress. Everyone will agree with that, even though there always are some who may not agree on whether the word "remarkable" should be said with a smile or a frown. I'm with the smilers myself. It has been a Congress of historic importance in my opinion and one that has taken giant strides in moving this nation forward. Its accomplishments are so many that I could, as I say, fill my time here today by merely listing them. But we need to do more than that. We need, I think to try and sift through this long list and put it in some kind of perspective. Take note not only of its dimensions but of the direction in which it is leading us. We need to measure what has been done in the past 18 months not only against what used to be but also against what ought to be.

Let me start with telling you of an action that took place less than a month ago. In early May, the House of Representatives passed a bill allocating the funds to be given the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for fiscal 1967. As Chairman of that Appropriations Subcommittee that has specific responsibility in the health field, I had a good deal to do with the action taken by the House. To state the action in brief, it was to increase the amount of money to be made available to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare by about $500 million above the level that the President had requested.

Some of the stories that I have seen reporting this action make much of the increase and, implicitly or explicitly, are critical of the fact that we raised the budget.

Now the first answer I have in response to such criticism is in the form of a question: What price tag do we put on good health for the nation? The budget figures, of course, are large, either before or after the House increase, because this is a big nation, a nation of 200 million people. Nonetheless, the money appropriated for HEW is less than 10 per cent of the total Federal budget; indeed, it is less than 2 per cent of the currently estimated Gross National Product. Viewed from this perspective, the figures seem to me to be reasonable. They seem to me to be especially reasonable when put beside the conviction I share with many other observers, that we are today in the midst of a revolutionary situation that calls for extraordinary efforts. And dentistry, as I have suggested in my title, is involved in a special manner in this revolution.

The word, "revolution" has a harsh ring to it. This is mostly, I suppose, because we associate it with violence and death, with bullets, bombs and battles. But revolution isn't necessarily violent. The term "peaceful revolution" is not self-contradictory. In fact, you can explain much of the genius of America, much of the reason for our remarkable strides as a nation to our ability to bring forth great changes in our society without having War act as mid-wife. Our political system is geared to honorable accommodation, to threshing out our differences in a townhall rather than on a battlefield. Our system broke down, our efforts failed, only once in our history and the result was the Civil War. For all its horrors or perhaps because of them, we learned even more clearly than we had before that our salvation as a united nation lay in anticipating coming challenges to our basic system and finding ways of adapting our social institutions to meet those challenges. We have the gift, in other words, for keeping our revolutions peaceful. It is my contention here today that the country is now in the midst of another one of those great challenges, that the core of it is in the health field and that, from dentistry's point of view, it has three aspects.

It began some five years ago when, as a nation—and I emphasize that phrase, "as a nation"—we first became acutely aware of the extent to which poverty, hunger, and disease dwell among us and of what they cost not only in terms of productive capacity but, more important, in terms of human anguish and misery. We began to see for the first time the reality behind the statistics that told us that 20 per cent of our country's families were poverty-stricken and that poverty tended to be self-perpetuating; that, in other words, a man who was poor tended to raise children who, because they lacked real access to education, health services and so forth, became poor themselves when they were grown.

The national awakening is the first phase of the revolution to which I refer.

The second phase is the realization that poor people are frequently sick people and, what is more, sick people who are not seeking or receiving the care that could restore them to health and to economic productivity. We learned that in many ways the poverty problem was a health problem. We learned, especially, that if we are to break that vicious self-perpetuation tendency of poverty to which I referred, that particular attention needed to be paid to the children of the poor. This realization of the health implications of poverty is the second phase of the revolution.

The third phase is the one of particular relevance here today. It has to do with dentistry and with the increasingly widespread understanding of the importance of oral health. The significance of dentistry's present situation can be shown most clearly, I think, by citing two of American dentistry's most salient characteristics: First, it is the world's best in terms of the education afforded the dentist, the research buttressing his work and the chairside care that he gives. Second, it is traditionally geared to take care of less than half the population. When you look at these two facts in conjunction with one another, it becomes clear that dentistry is going to feel much of the force of this health-centered revolution I am talking about.

Now, let me make one point quite clear before going any further. When I note that dentistry is geared to care for less than half the population, I am not being critical of your profession or undervaluing the immense efforts you have made through the years to make dental care as accessible as possible to everyone. Your efforts in the direction of extending accessibility of care are well known to me and I can say honestly that, in my opinion, you have over the years done nearly as much as could be humanly done. But you have had a number of factors working against you. For many years, there was little public understanding of the importance of dental health. People tended to view dental disease as something to be lived with, something to be endured unless and until severe pain drove them to the dentist. In addition, government on all levels—local, state and federal—did almost nothing to assist your efforts to raise the dental health standards of the country and make care more accessible. Dental public health activities, for example, were shamefully neglected for years. If there is blame to distribute then, very little of it goes to the dental profession itself.

Nevertheless, the fact I have cited remains today a fact. I say "today" because it takes no special gift of prophecy to see that it will not be true much longer. Three factors explain the change that is coming that indeed has already begun. First of all, the consistent activity of the American Dental Association and its friends is paying dividends. Secondly, the public awareness of health and of dental health is daily becoming keener. And finally, as a result of these two factors, those of us in Congress who have so long fought for a deeper national commitment to health matters are being joined by more and more colleagues.

In a sense, though, we are involved in a race; a race between the rising demand for dental care and our efforts to increase the accessibility of such care. Let me spend a minute or two, at this point, discussing some of the things Congress is doing to help the right side to win the race.

There is, first of all, the attention being paid to the two major dental agencies of the Government: The Division of Dental Health and the National Institute of Dental Research. Their appropriations over the past six years have been rising steadily, equipping them more and more adequately to attack the immense backlog of problems in dental research and dental public health that were so neglected for so many years. For fiscal 1967, the House approved a combined appropriation in excess of $33 million, an increase of 450 percent over the Presidential recommendation of fiscal 1960. The bulk of this increase has gone toward strengthening the basic fiber of these two agencies. The dental schools of the nation have benefited greatly from this because of the greater amount of money available for the schools' research activities and for such programs as training dental students to work effectively with dental auxiliaries. Grant money is available now, that wasn't in fiscal 1960, for distribution to State public health agencies for dental activities. Epidemiological research in cleft palate and in periodontal disease is now possible. Investigations of the best methods to provide continuing education for you gentlemen in private practice is now possible. Programs for training young scientists in fields of dental interest have been greatly expanded. New departures of all kinds are possible today that couldn't even be considered in fiscal 1960 because of the scarcity of funds.

In the fiscal 1967 budget approved by the House, for example, an important further step is being taken for the first time: funds are being made available to implement a plan that I am deeply interested in, the establishment of a limited number of university-based dental research institutes in various parts of the country. Until now, as you know, the National Institute of Dental Research has been unique in the United States.

For some time it has seemed important to me to create privately-based counterparts to NIDR in three or four carefully selected locations. The American Dental Association, too, has had a deep interest in the matter and has testified to it before my Subcommittee on more than one occasion. Plans have been in the offing for some time but now, finally, we will be able to move ahead toward the actual establishment of such centers.

During this same span of years, new legislation has been also passed directed toward helping the nation to close the gap between what it is doing in the health field and what it should be doing. Paramount among these, I would suppose, must be listed the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act which was originally approved in 1963 and substantially expanded in 1965. Again, I think it should be noted, the American Dental Association long advocated such action and was a prime mover in its eventual accomplishment. Your own state's new dental school, now being planned, is a beneficiary of this act as is the school at the University of California at Los Angeles. Other new schools are being planned in Florida, South Carolina and Colorado. Many existing schools will be able—some have already begun—to expand and rehabilitate their facilities.

I know there are some who view this expansion of dental manpower with something less than enthusiasm, not out of selfish motives but because they are unconvinced of its necessity. But such men have not really analyzed the force or extent of the revolution in which we are engaged. They fail to understand that we are not talking merely about improving the care we give to those who traditionally seek dental services on a regular basis. What we are doing is readying ourselves for a new era in the history of dentistry in the United States, a time in which every man, woman, and child in our nation will seek dental care on a regular basis and find it accessible. This is an immense undertaking and the terms of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act are modest enough in relation to it.

In addition to its provisions for construction and rehabilitation of schools, this Act has two sections of direct consequence for the day-to-day operation of a dental school. One provides loans and scholarships to dental students, thus making dentistry possible for many talented young people who in the past would have had to settle for their second career choice. Such assistance has long been available to students working toward graduate degrees in science fields not related to health, a factor that weighed heavily against the health schools in the competition for the best students. It was an unsatisfactory and unfair situation and we have moved none too soon in redressing it.

Another section of the Act provides direct grants to health schools, such as those in dentistry, to make improvements in the scope and quality of the curriculum they offer. The growth rate of new knowledge in the health field, as you well know, is almost literally beyond comprehension. Yet, if the bulk of this new knowledge is not swiftly conveyed to dental students, and practitioners already in the field, its accumulation will have been in vain. This new section of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act—this section was passed last year and is not yet really in operation—will enable the schools to address themselves to this problem with an intensity not possible before because of lack of funds.

Another program bearing directly on this revolution is that of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Among their activities, the one of particular interest in the health field is Operation Head Start. The essential effort, as you know, is to bring to children of pre-school age that whole range of educational and health services that they have either not been receiving or have been receiving only in a minimal, haphazard fashion.

Before the program began in the summer of 1965, American Dental Association representatives told Head Start officials that they would discover that dental disease would be one of the major problems they would encounter. That prediction was accurate, as you would expect it to be since it was based on the Association's long-standing effort, in which I have joined, to persuade the government to pay greater attention to the dental needs of poor children.

Let me note at this point, incidentally, that I am well aware of the fact that the Head Start program, viewed from the state and local level, was quite confusing. Much of the explanation of this is because it was a new program and one gotten underway hastily. I have had occasion to bring this to Mr. Shriver's attention when he has testified before me and I think you will find in the future that the organization and coherence of the program will improve. One example of this improvement is that the Dental Division of the Public Health Serviec is now intimately involved with planning the dental aspects of Head Start.

The final program I want to bring to your attention today is one that passed Congress last summer and is just now going into operation. It will prove, in my opinion, to be as fundamentally far-reaching as anything that has been done in the health field in this century. There has been in existence for some time a program of Federal-state cooperation bringing health services to various categories of the needy. These programs were brought together and expanded in the action taken last summer to form a new section, Title 19, of the Social Security Act.

Under this new program, the states must offer at least five basic health services in order to qualify for the Federal matching money, which can range from 55 to 83 per cent of the total. At the present time, dental care is not one of the five requisite services, though an effort I favored was made by the American Dental Association to have it so listed. The effort was launched during Senate hearings on the measure last year and succeeded there but failed to survive a House-Senate Conference. Nonetheless, of the seven states now having approved programs under this new Title 19, four of them are offering dental services of some type. This trend will unquestionably continue as more states realign their health and welfare efforts in order to qualify under Title 19. As you undoubtedly know, Connecticut expects to so qualify before the end of 1966.

Two straws in the wind buttressing this prediction as to the inclusion of dental services are the fact that your national organization, in its 1965 annual meeting, called for a national dental program for needy children and the fact that this spring President Johnson took up the subject and directed HEW Secretary Gardner to begin development of such a program. Officials of HEW and the American Dental Association are already conferring on such a program and Congress may well be looking at it as early as next year.

Now, let me raise a warning flag about Title 19. Revolutions, you know, are not in the habit of moving smoothly. Those who want to help manage them and direct them have to be quick on their feet. On the national level, I can assure you, dentistry is being well and actively represented. But Title 19's impact is going to be focused on the states and communities of the nation. A parallel effort, then, must be launched there. I have no doubt that you are already in close consultation with the state officials planning Connecticut's participation under this program but I do want to urge you to persevere in that consultation. I consider it essential that such state officials have the benefit of your expert advice in designing the dental aspects of the new program and, I would judge, you consider it just as essential.

This survey of the components of our present day revolution in the health field could go on much further than it has already. I have not even referred, for example, to the expanding field of pre-payment and the progressive role being played by the dental service corporations. Nor have I discussed today—though I have often before and am deeply interested in it—the remarkable leadership the dentists have shown in the utilization of auxiliary personnel. As a high official of HEW recently remarked, the physicians of the nation could take lessons from the dentists on this matter of auxiliaries. Dr. Fones, who had so much to do with founding the career field of dental hygiene, would be proud of his successors on this and many other matters.

Indeed, everything we know of Dr. Fones' interest in preventive dentistry and in the dental health of children makes me believe that he would be glad to be alive today. This may not be an easy time in which to live, but it is an exciting time. No generaiton of health leaders in the past had opportunities equal to those available today. This is particularly true in dentistry.

I know you will take full advantage of these opportunities to extend the quality and availability of your services to a point far beyond what they have ever been before in our history. You will, I know, be open-minded, progressive and constructive in your attitude toward the health revolution in which you are engaged. I want you to know that I will continue to be associated with your efforts and anxious to assist you in every way possible.

It has been a great pleasure for me to be here with you today and to accept this Award that you have so generously given me. I look forward to being with you again in the future. Thank you.

Dedication of Stephens Lake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Sunday, July 17, I participated in the dedication of Lake Stephens in Raleigh County, W. Va. This $2.25 million recreational complex was made possible by a Federal grant of $1.2 million, allocated under the authority assigned to the former Community Facilities Administration. I was instrumental in securing approval of these Federal funds, and it was with deep gratification that I participated in the activities marking official recognition of the project's completion.

I ask unanimous consent that my dedicatory remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEDICATION OF STEPHENS LAKE

(Speech by U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, at Stephens Lake, Raleigh County, W. Va., July 17, 1966)

As I look around me today, in this beautiful setting, to these excellent facilities which will help people enjoy their free hours, I am reminded that the question was asked in Washington recently whether "our new age of leisure is a blessing or a curse?"

I believe that the answer can well be stated here today. We can count this as a blessing that Stephens Lake, the history of which goes back to the 1790's when Stephen English journeyed here, has been preserved and developed wisely for the wholesome recreation of our people.

There are many people who deserve commendation for this project, but at this time I will mention Mr. Harry Anderson, who was one of the first to dream of this development and whose personal endeavors helped to generate strong public support. I will also mention Fred Toothman whose tireless efforts led to the selection of the site, and Robert L. Davis who supervised the planning and construction activities.

Needless to say, Mr. Ping Johnson and his fellow members on the Stephens Lake Tourist Development Authority deserve the gratitude and continuing support of our people in the years to come in efforts to maintain and expand the recreational value of this facility.

I became convinced of the value of this project early in its history, and I was instrumental in winning approval of a $1.2 million grant for it from the former Community Facilities Administration. I believed it was a wise investment for government funds at that time, and your presence here today proves further that I was not incorrect in that belief. From my membership on the Senate Appropriations Committee and its Subcommittee which votes funds for the Commerce Department, I was pleased to support the funding programs which made possible such projects as this one. I believed then as I believe today that West Virginia will some day become one of the most popular and properly developed tourist centers in the country.

West Virginia appears to be fully aware of the growing realization in the world that man is not outside of nature, but a part of nature . . . that nature is not only a commodity we can exploit for gain, but it is also an estimate to which we belong.

This new dimension of conservation includes the past—as we see here at Stephens Lake—as well as the present; the beautiful as well as the useful; social as well as economic values; and urban neighborhoods as well as landscapes.

We in America are engaged in a massive protest against the destruction of historic landmarks, against the pollution of water and air, against the blight of unplanned development with its bleak, cheerless, monotonous march across the countryside.

There is a growing awareness that the United States will not be judged by its power alone, but also by the quality of its civilization.

I believe that Henry David Thoreau's decision to "live deliberately"—to absorb the natural world around him, not merely, through the physical senses, into his physical being but also into his deepest thoughts, to scorn artificiality and to find richness in simplicity—is the nutrient of our culture.

Of course, I realize that the growing needs of an expanding population place a financial burden on a community to take land out of the market for commercial developments. I realize that assets such as these carry a price that must be paid. And it may be legitimately asked, "How can these resources put meat on the table?"

To begin with, I want to say that beautiful scenery, clear water, and fish and wildlife wil put meat on the table. They will help the community.

It has been estimated that Stephens Lake may someday attract a quarter-million visitors annually. With the camping area and trailer park in operation, we can expect the tourists to stay for several days, maybe even several weeks. Would that add up to perhaps a million tourist days a year? I would think so.

Then think of the expenditures by these guests. In Washington, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation believes the average tourist—that is each person in a group—may spend up to $7.00 a day. If so, that income could soar to several million dolars a year for West Virginia, and more particularly, the Raleigh county area.

Our own West Virginia Department of Commerce reports that revenue from out-of-state tourists, traveling West Virginians, and vacationers in this state resulted in $417 million in income to the state last year. And, I am told, these are figures taken from tax reports on the five segments of the tourist economy—restaurants, amusement and recreation centers, lodgings, service stations, and auto accessory establishments.

This income resulted from some 13 million tourists and travelers in the state. This year, it has been estimated that the number of travelers in the State should grow to 14 million and the anticipated income is conservatively placed at $425 million.

I am told that with the completion of the interstate highways West Virginia can expect its tourist income to skyrocket to about three-quarters of a billion dollars a year derived from about 25 million visitors.

Needless to say, it will then compete with other branches of our economy to eventually become the largest industry in the State.

When Congress established the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area by legislation which I introduced, it took cognizance that at least 100,000 acres of this State's natural setting was needed as a "hide-away" for visiting tourists and recreation seekers.

The Land and Water Conservation Act, which I was happy to co-sponsor, has already accounted for the acquisition of land and the development of tourist centers at a cost of $251 million in just three years.

Administered by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the fund provides for state as well as Federal projects. It will also finance a nation-wide outdoor recreation plan which, I am confident, will include Stephens Lake as a major feature in Raleigh County.

As I close, let me say that only a few years ago, the people of the United States were secure in a seemingly endless earth and confident of boundless bounty.

Today there is still plenty of everything to go around. But more and more people are beginning to watch more and more anxiously as science and technology attempt to stretch a predictably finite wealth of natural resources to cover ever growing demands.

The handwriting on our natural resources wall could read: "A rationed tomorrow."

Twentieth century man in the United States must choose—and the fact that we have a choice is strictly a matter of geography. In most parts of the world, a quality society is unattainable in the foreseeable future.

Currently we are in the seventh decade of a 100-year-span that began in 1900 with a world population of fewer than 1.5 billion persons. That same population is now hurtling toward 3.5 billion.

With developments such as Stephens Lake, our people will have elbow room and an opportunity for occasional solitude. Thank you.

Wounded Marine Twin Brothers From Hawaii Face Future With Intrepidity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is a tribute to America that our dispatches from Vietnam are filled with news of the valor and sacrifice of our fighting men. An unusual story of such sacrifice is that of two marines who are twin brothers, Richard and Ronald Sanoria. Their home is in a little town called Pahoa, on the island of Hawaii. The touching news story of the coincidental amputation of their left leg was recently published in many of the Nation's newspapers. I should like to share with you the sequel to this story of the brothers who suffered similar injuries under similar circumstances in Vietnam.

The marine brothers are now recuperating at the U.S. Army Tripler General Hospital in Honolulu. Richard, who has already been fitted with an artificial leg, sits regularly at the bedside of Ronald who only recently has undergone surgery. Despite their handicap, the brothers, who are not yet 20, are hopefully looking to the future.

I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this inspirational story of the Sanoria brothers which was written by Reporter Lyle Nelson. It appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of July 20, 1966:

TWIN ISLE AMPUTEES, NOT YET 20, LOOK TOWARD THE FUTURE

(By Lyle Nelson)

Richard Sanoria sits in an air conditioned room at Tripler Hospital each day watching television.

His twin, Ronald, lies near him watching television.

Ronald's eyes open and close as he rests. He's had recent surgery.

They talk from time to time.

This is the convalescent routine for the Marine twins from Pahoa, Big Island, who both suffered coincidental amputation of the left leg above the knee after similar mine explosions near Da Nang, Viet Nam.

They look at the future a little, but not too far ahead.

Richard is much further along than Ronald at this point.

He was wounded longer ago and not as severely.

Today, Richard set in Ronald's third floor room in the Tirpler Surgical Ward and talked of their future.

"We want to got to school," he said, "probably at the university."

"That's what we're figuring."

He didn't know just what they would study or whether they would some day go into business together.

Richard, who already has been fitted with an artificial leg, did the talking.

He said they probably would return to Pahoa, the little Puna town they call home, the town that rarely gets into the news except when threatened by a lava flow.

Richard is the inspiration for Ronald now.

Richard can get around the hospital. Mobility means greater hope. No one likes to lie in bed, day after day.

Richard probably will be the leader for many months to come.

He figures on getting out of Tripler and the service next month.

For Ronald, the healing process will take longer.

Ronald arrived in Hawaii to a tearful reunion with his twin, two other brothers and parents a week ago. He had been hospitalized in the Philippines.

Richard's room at Tripler is on the fourth floor. He grabs his crutches and comes down the elevator to the third floor every day to sit with his brother. Their mother, Mrs. Rose Augstin, is there also.

Richard and his mother put on white gowns and a paper mask before they enter Ronald's private room.

This is to reduce the chances of Ronald getting an infection.

Things will get better for the twins, but it will take time and patience.

They have plenty of time to plan the years ahead.

They aren't 20 years old yet.

Good News—Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, another newspaper highlights a dispatch from correspondent Keyes Beech reporting that the situation is looking better for our side in Asia.

Mr. Beech writes for the Chicago Daily News Service, and now the Houston Chronicle points out that his optimistic dispatch contained virtually the same key words as it had used previously in an editorial.

Not only are the hostilities in southeast Asia going in our favor, the Chronicle says, but communism is losing ground in the entire arc from Korea to Karachi.

This is taking place behind the shield of American power, it is said. And as Mr. Beech wrote:

> Without the United States, South Korea would be Communist today. So would South Vietnam.

So that my colleagues may examine the views of Mr. Beech and the Houston newspaper, I submit the editorial for the Record:

Flood of Good News in Asia

"From Korea to Karachi, all along the sprawling periphery of Red China, things are looking up for our side." So write Keyes Beech of the Chicago Daily News Foreign Service from Thailand.

Beech, who of all war correspondents has proven perhaps the most accurate in his assessments of situations and prospects, employed virtually the same key words in his Monday story as this newspaper used in an editorial last Friday.

His rather lengthy article explored the situation in greater depth than a comparatively brief editorial could. And it made most satisfactory reading.

That the hostilities in Southeast Asia are going in our favor is obvious to all. But perhaps more important, as both Beech and this newspaper have pointed out, communism is losing ground in the entire arc "from Korea to Karachi" and impressive gains for the cause of freedom have taken place.

Item: Indonesia has turned back from the brink of communism and has turned somewhat westward. "Without the resolute United States stand in South Viet Nam there would have been little incentive for the anti-Communists to take the gamble that they did," Beech comments, and hints that United States assistance might have been given to those who brought off the coup.

Item: Indonesia has quit threatening Malaysia; the Philippines have dropped their dispute with that new nation.

Item: Pakistan's flirting with Red China has "cooled."

Item: The nations of the Far East and South Pacific have shown signs of getting together with a distinct anti-Red China program. Nine of them, including Japan, recently formed the Asian and Pacific Council—a loose association, to be sure, but nonetheless constructive.

Item: India is shifting "more and more toward a freer economy, much to the indignation of old-fashioned doctrinaire Socialist supporters" of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's late father.

Item: "What makes the rise of non-communist Asia all the more encouraging is the fact that it has a solid economic base. . . . Last year the economic growth rate in South Korea was 8 percent, in Taiwan (Nationalist China) 7 percent, in Malaysia 5.5 percent, and in Thailand 6 percent. . . . Among the non-communist nations only Burma, possibly the most mismanaged nation in Asia next to Indonesia, and Cambodia cling to the socialist path."

"It could be," Beech writes, that ". . . Asia has reached that long-awaited turning point when the non-communist nations are in the ascendancy and communism is on the decline." This is taking place "behind the shield of American power," of course. "Without the United States, South Korea would be communist today. So would South Viet Nam."

Herald Counseling Center: "To Save Families Disintegrating Under the Effects of Alcohol"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 14197, for a comprehensive program for the control of alcoholism and my statement with respect thereto appears at pages 6973 to 6975 of the Congressional Record of March 31, 1966.

Since that time, I have made reference to the problem and to the organizations in my district with the aim of doing something about the problem, like ACCEPT or Alcoholism Center Coordinating Education, Prevention and Treatment—Appendix page A3173, Congressional Record of June 13, 1966—and New York City Medical Society on Alcoholism, Inc., and the Physician's Alcohol Newsletter—Appendix page A3262, Congressional Record of June 16, 1966.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the circular of the Herald Counseling Center of 235 East 49th Street, New York City, of which Daniel A. Poling is president and Buford Peterson is director, whose purpose is "to save families disintegrating under the effects of alcoholism."

Herald Counseling Center

THE PROBLEM

For every alcoholic, there is a circle of people affected who suffer just as much—beginning with his wife and dependent children. Alcoholism spawns broken homes, delinquency, despair and mental illness. It causes incalculable disruption in the lives of innocent children, and through them eats into the whole fabric of soicety.

THE SOLUTION: A BOLD NEW PROGRAM

Under the joint sponsorship of the *Christian Herald* and the New York Theological Seminary, the Herald Counseling Center is a bold new program to save families disintegrating under the effects of alcoholism. It combines the best skills and insights of Christian counseling, medical science and the special techniques of psychology and psychiatry to make the family as a *whole* understand the illness of alcoholism, and to make each of its members work together constructively to overcome the disease.

A REVOLUTIONARY NEW APPROACH

The whole problem of alcoholism is attacked at its very roots through the radical new approach of the Center's "halfway house". Here men can find food, clothing, rest, shelter and the peace and quiet in a home-like atmosphere which is so necessary to begin sober self-examination.

EXPERT AND EXPERIENCED COUNSELORS

All staff members of the Center have themselves—with God's help—overcome chronic and uncontrollable drinking problems, loss of jobs and families. They are therefore uniquely qualified to counsel newly released alcoholics and inspire them to stop drinking *for good* (they've been through the same sad experience before and know all the answers).

STEPS TOWARD REHABILITATION

In an atmosphere of Christian acceptance, the counselor can soon gain the confidence of the alcoholic and give him the strength to become a productive member of society again. Medical attention, proper diet and new clothing transform his physical appearance. Soon he is able to seek assistance on his own—as needed—from outpatient clinics and social welfare agencies. Finally, employment is gained for the alcoholic, thus increasing his self-respect and confidence.

THE ULTIMATE GOAL: FAMILY RECONCILIATION

When the time is ripe, families are contacted and meetings held in the neutral atmosphere of the Center. Under the friendly guidance of the counselor, the family can discuss its future calmly in a quiet, noninstitutional atmosphere. Reconciliation is tremendously aided by the great improvement shown by the alcoholic in stabilizing himself and holding a job for a long period of time.

BENEFITS TO SOCIETY

With the father reunited to his wife and children again, the family is no longer a drain on society but once more a productive unit. Children's anti-social conduct disappears with the father once more discharging his duties of parental understanding and discipline. (Note: over 30% of all juvenile delinquents and a high proportion of school drop-outs come from homes where the parent is an alcoholic). The worth of all these benefits in human terms can hardly be calculated.

DESPERATELY NEEDED: FUNDS FOR EXPANSION

Five full time members of the Center staff are presently giving understanding counsel and guidance to alcoholics in dire straits. Several regularly make the rounds of the courts, prisons, hospital wards and the Bowery offering help to needy men with families. But a severe shortage of funds keeps them from counseling all those who want and need their understanding aid. Thousands more can be helped to return to normal living—but only if you will contribute desperately needed funds for expansion. Won't you send your generous gift today? Thank you.

Horton Bill To Establish a Commission on Architecture and Planning for the Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States, whom we in the House of Representatives are honored to represent, are disturbed; the proposal to extend the west front of the Capitol—their Capitol—has justifiably disturbed them. It is ironic that the proposal is partially based on the need for expanded tourist facilities, yet in providing these it is marring the greatest attraction of visitors to our Capital City. It is the private citizen of our country—for whom the Capitol is a symbol as well as a beautiful building—who is most greatly aroused by the recommended alteration of the west front.

It is evident that he would rather the much-needed tourist facilities be forgotten. Yet, the establishment of essential facilities, be they for storage of documents, restaurants, or tourist centers must not be forgotten, neither must the already established symbolism and beauty of the Capitol be forgotten.

Certainly, the protection of our great monumental buildings is as important as the protection of monumental documents. If such protection must be effected through legislation, then it is essential that such legislation be enacted.

I am today introducing a bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, to establish a Commission on Architecture and Planning for the Capitol. It cannot be denied that certain construction projects are necessary for the improvements of the U.S. Capitol Grounds and adjacent areas. Yet, such projects must meet standards of good taste and judgment, retain esthetic and architectural values, and demonstrate the historic and symbolic importance of our Nation's Capitol.

The Commission which my bill provides will review such proposed projects as the extension of the west front and advise how they might be carried out so that necessary standards will not be violated. Qualified professionals will help compose the nine-member Commission, seven of whom will be appointed by the President, one of whom will be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and one of whom will be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate. Nominations for the members will come from groups which will be rightfully represented on the Commission—the American Institute of Architects, the American Society of Landscape Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Federal Council on Arts and Humanities, and the Commission of Fine Arts. The members appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate will represent the private citizens to whom the preservation of the Capitol is of such critical concern and importance.

I am pleased to note that my bill parallels that sponsored by Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, on which his subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee is holding hearings today. Hon. ODGEN REID, a member of Chairman THOMPSON's subcommittee, also is a sponsor of this proposed legislation.

Regulation 5 of the Medicare Provisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished pathologist and delegate to the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association, Dr. Lall G. Montgomery, of Muncie, Ind., has brought a matter to my attention, which I feel should be of interest of the entire Congress. Dr. Montgomery has asked that I ask permission to have his letter of July 22, 1966, to Mr. Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security Administration, reprinted in the RECORD.

I feel that this letter will be of interest and explains the difficulty concerning regulation No. 5 of the medicare provisions:

JULY 22, 1966.

Mr. ROBERT M. BALL,
Social Security Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BALL: I am writing to raise objections to the proposed "Principles of Reimbursement for Services by Hospital-based Physicians" (Regulations No. 5) as published in the Federal Register, Volume 31, No. 124, and dated Tuesday, June 28, 1966.

First of all I would object to the fact that these Regulations were not published until two days before the effective date of Public Law 89-97 which the Regulations No. 5 modify to a very great extent. This late publication gave no adequate time to study the enormously complex implications of the Regulations as they affect the practice of medicine by a wide variety of physicians who practice to a greater or lesser extent in relation to hospitals.

As you are aware an urgent request from the American Medical Association House of Delegates was brought to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Board of Trustees of the American Medical Association asking for a delay of 90 days in the effective date of adoption of these Regulations to permit adequate study and revision of the proposals they contained. I understand that this request has been refused and I am writing now to protest, and to urge further that these Regulations should be carefully reviewed with the help of representatives from the groups of physicians most affected and who would be most likely to know how best the Regulations should be written to produce the best possible effect on the practice of medicine and consequently the most effective care of the patients who will be affected.

My objections to the Regulations as proposed cannot be described in detail at this time because, as stated above, time has not been adequate to make an analysis of the far reaching implications of the Regulations. It is, however, obvious to anyone who has read them that parts of the Regulations make sweeping alterations in the intent of Public Law 89-97 in ways which were clearly not the wish of Congress when this law was passed.

To mention only one very far reaching alteration by Regulations 5, of the intent of Congress in writing Public Law 89-97, I draw to your attention the fact that it was repeatedly apparent that Congress wished it abundantly clear that the law should not interfere in the practice of medicine (e.g. 89-97, Sec. 1801).

Even the most cursory reading of the recently published Regulations makes it apparent that they vastly alter the practice of medicine in many ways which would affect the practice of a wide range of physicians from many medical fields who care for patients in hospitals. These interferences in the practice of medicine were not the intent of Congress when the Law was passed, and I do not believe they are the will of Congress now. Certainly they would not be the wish of any person who understands the effect which these Regulations would have on the care of the health of the patients affected by the Law, and the even farther reaching effects of these changes on the ultimate overall practice of medicine for the entire American people.

I would earnestly plead for careful study and complete revision of the Regulations as recently published, to bring them in line with the wishes of Congress as expressed in Public Law 89-97, and with the objective of utilizing the rewritten Regulations to bring about the best possible application of the law to the care of the patients provided for in the law.

Yours sincerely,
LALL G. MONTGOMERY, M.D.,
Delegate, Section of Pathology and Physiology, American Medical Association.

The Older Americans Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

The Older Americans Act

(By Hon. John E. Fogarty)

I very much appreciate the introduction by Commissioner Bechill and welcome this opportunity to be with you at this 4th Annual Conference of State Executives on Aging.

Addressing you at this stage of this program has some very obvious disadvantages. I am sure that Mr. Bechill's "Challenge to the States" and the panel discussions on"Goals for Older Americans" have covered much of what should be included in a presentation on "The Older Americans Act."

There are however some compensating advantages in preceding "Progress Report on the Administration on Aging" and the "Workshops on the Older Americans Act."

It can prove interesting, embarrassing and challenging to review some of the basic objections Congress had in mind at the time this legislation was enacted, the status of the "action time schedule" and some observations on future directions.

It is not possible to recall the goals of the Older Americans Act without paying a very personal tribute to the late Senator Pat McNamara, a great humanitarian, statesman and a close personal friend who cosponsored the Bill and with whom I worked so closely for the creation of an independent Commission of Aging. He dedicated his life to serving others and making the country he served a better place for his fellow men of all ages.

Older Americans of today and the future beneficiaries of the programs he sponsored and supported will long revere the memory of Senator Pat McNamara.

Without reviewing each of the ten objectives included under Title One of the Older Americans Act, I prefer to summarize the broad goals outlined in the Bill and review the intent expressed in the remarks and statements made on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Experience and public reaction to our floundering national program in aging documented the urgency and need to create an Administration on Aging to salvage the recommendations of the White House Conference on Aging and to establish an action-oriented program free to operate without the influence and domination of other programs or policies.

The Congressional Record clearly reveals the intent to remove aging from a welfare setting and to eliminate any doubt in the minds of older persons or the public that aging and welfare were synonymous or that most of the elderly were welfare clients or recipients. There was no implied criticism of the fine work of public assistance programs or agencies but a desire to represent a more accurate picture of the interests and needs of all older persons.

The lack of funds for research, training and demonstration projects had restricted action in aging to conference reports and recommedations. A grant program became essential as a vital force in the stimulation, support and implementation of practical projects.

Qualified staff to administer a dynamic program was an obvious must together with a nongovernmental advisory committee to recommend and endorse action programs on aging.

A strong partnership between federal, state and local programs was needed to coordinate, initiate and strengthen activities and to avoid overlapping, duplication and sometimes competing projects.

As you know, from the help and the action on the floor of the House there was an expressed intent for State executives on aging to be informed of pending applications for grants but not to the extent of overruling the approval of an application that was considered to have merit.

It should also have been obvious to those who were aware of the budget allocations, that with the creation of an Administration on Aging the need for the President's Council on Aging as originally constituted, no longer existed. The budget for the Council was eliminated believing that the Administration on Aging with its commissioner would preclude the need for a statutory body to carry out an interdepartmental program on aging.

It is my understanding that a Subcommittee of the Advisory Committee has been named to work out interagency relationships on aging. This approach is in keeping with the intent of the authors of the bill.

There were many other factors that influenced the language of the Older Americans Act. It was considered to be basic legislation with a specific budget allocation for the first two years. During this time the experience of the Administration and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee would determine a more realistic budget and long-range program projection.

So much for background. I would like to speak frankly about the progress in the implementation of the legislation as I see it.

My impressions are based on reports of the Administration appropriation hearings and information referred to me by my constituents and the general public.

The interest shown by the states and the number of their plans approved is encouraging. Most of the intents have designated nonwelfare agencies or departments to administer the funds. Some of these designations are regarded as temporary pending further consideration by the state legislatures when they reconvene. Several state welfare or public assistance agencies have established reputations for efficient broadly based programs for the aging. It can be expected to develop action that will support the principles of the Older Americans Act. At the fear of being misunderstood, it would still be my hope that the Administration on Aging would gradually evolve as an independent nonwelfare administered program at the federal, state and local levels. The next two years give us the experience we need and the time to evaluate the capacity and the abilities of the authorities now being named by the states to lead their programs in aging.

The summaries of applications approved for grants under Title IV and V for Research and Development and Training Projects appear very modest and seem to lack that dynamic quality that will be needed to meet the urgent demands in those areas so long neglected or overdue.

I will also have to admit that I have not been made aware of any fresh or new approaches. Most of the approved grants have gone to support projects that seem to be restatements or updated versions of older programs and have been given to organizations that have developed skill in "grantsmanship." I would hope that the funds available might also find their way to support truly different and more imaginative projects.

Engaging qualified staff to administer a program with the broad implications of the Older Americans Act is a difficult task in a field where so little specialization or formal training has existed. Personnel must of necessity come from related areas where the experience and abilities can be translated or converted to meet the demands of the new assignment. I believe the Administration has been fortunate in obtaining the services of well-qualified personnel commensurate with program needs.

Effective utilization of the experience of the career employees or the staff can also be of great assistance in the orientation of new personnel in the continuity of the on going programs previously continued on by the former office and staff on aging.

There is little doubt that the public will be very conscious of "a new day for older Americans" through the theme and emphasis of "Senior Citizen Month." This reflects a great deal of effort and a job well done. I can add only that if we can develop such widespread acceptance and cooperation for one month we should be able to extend it to a twelve month program.

I am going to shift to another emphasis of what appears to be happening in the national focus for Action in Aging. While we have made great progress in creating a more independent, dignified and purposeful role for the aging more and more projects seem to be slipping into a poverty oriented setting.

The testimony endorsing the Administration on Aging and the Older Americans Act stresses the needs for a clearly defined focal point for aging at the federal level. A review of some of the grant programs would raise some doubts as to whether this has been achieved.

The recent reports of the Special Committee on Aging of the U.S. Senate in those sections on the Office of Economic Opportunity, says:

"The OEO should recognize before it begins its second year of work the neglect of the elderly now will lead only to costly, hastily improvised crash programs later on and that additional authority might be given to the OEO for greater service to the elderly."

Without passing judgment on the desirability of extending additional authority to OEO for programs for the aging, I think you, as State Executives on Aging, should react in your workshops to consider whether the need is to strengthen it and expand the Administration on Aging and its budget rather than diffuse the programs.

It might be noted that the Foster Grandparent program is being funded by OEO and is actually being continued under the auspices of AOA.

Healthy competition often serves a useful purpose but I question the wisdom of dividing authority or creating parallel and conflicting programs. A greater need exists for coordinating Federal programs in aging than ever before.

May I suggest some of the areas of possible overlap or conflict:

1. Medicare Alert program was declared to be a success and the information and techniques applicable to other programs addressed to the effort. I would ask what programs and by whom, remembering the project was funded by the Social Security Administration and the Office of Economic Opportunity with "excellent cooperation by the AOA."

2. Home Health Aides with $2½ million allocated by OEO will be carried out in cooperation with the Public Health Service.

3. The entire field of Consumer Education for the Elderly and the proposed National Conference on Quackery have great significance for the older Americans. Where do you at the State level and the AOA sit in to these consumer programs?

4. Under the Neighborhood Facilities Feature of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966, space and facilities for various social and recreational activities are included as action centers used by the elderly. At what point in the planning and programming do you and the AOA become invloved?

Each of you with your knowledge and responsibilities can do much to keep our sights clear and the channels of authority well-defined. We must not encourage or permit our programs at any level to lead to playing one against the other. We cannot afford to dilute or diffuse the funds or staff. Our job has just begun and we can only achieve our goals on a team approach.

Because I am so deeply concerned that we have delayed so long in implementing the recommendations of the White House Conference on Aging and we have an obligation to the 3000 knowledgeable individuals and delegates who contributed so much to the success of that meeting, I am planning a conference with the leaders of the forum in Providence, Rhode Island.

It would be my hope that we might be able to reappraise action in aging suggested at the White House meeting and develop the "Blueprint for Action" that was promised but never forthcoming after the White House Conference.

Details of my meeting will be available shortly and I hope that many of you will be able to share your time and experience, especially those who participated in the White House Conference.

Perhaps we can call it a Mid-Decade Progress Report on the implementation of the White House Conference on Aging recommendations. I believe we owe it to those who worked so hard and expected so much of that meeeting.

Not able to forget my role as supporter of the White House Conference on Aging Act or that as Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Appropriations, I believe there is still great mileage in the reports of the Conference and a greater realization of the funds that were expended for it.

I leave this as a further challenge to you in your workshops and assure you of my continued interest and support in practical action programs toward achieving a more rewarding role for the aging in the Great Society.

Why Tolerate It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the strike by machinists against five major airlines is now in its third week. It has crippled commerce, inconvenienced many thousands of citizens, and caused untold delays in the functions of government—including the effort in South Vietnam. This strike must not continue.

I believe strongly in the collective bargaining process between labor and business. However, it is apparent to me that this process is not working in the airline strike. There seem to be several alternatives for settling the dispute. They include:

First, having the full weight of the Office of the President of the United States being thrown into negotiations; second, the passage of legislation in Congress which either would prohibit prolonged strikes involving the transportation and communications industries which are harmful to the national interest, or merely legislation requiring arbitration in this one instance.

Of these alternatives, the former appears to be the most appropriate at the moment. However, if a way to solve this conflict is not found soon, legislation by Congress would appear to be inevitable. I introduce for the RECORD an editorial on this subject from the July 21, 1966, edition of the Washington Evening Star:

WHY TOLERATE IT?

The President's performance, in his press conference remarks on the airline strike, was much less than flattering to the architect of the Great Society.

He began by saying that Secretary of Labor Wirtz had made a strong statement on the strike, which he had. The gist of the Wirtz statement was that the striking International Association of Machinists was "making a farce of collective bargaining." The Labor Secretary denounced the threat to break off negotations and said that the cost to the public of protracted negotiations is "intolerable."

Well, if the cost is intolerable, why tolerate it?

Because, said the President, there is nothing more that he can do under existing law. He had appointed an impartial emergency board, headed by Senator Morse, which had made an eminently fair proposal for settling the dispute. The struck airlines, said Mr. Johnson, had agreed to accept the proposal. But it was then spurned by the union. What more than this, the President seemed to be saying, could he be expected to accomplish?

A reporter asked about an earlier presidential promise to submit legislation to Congress to protect the public from crippling strikes. Well, said Mr. Johnson, he was having a little trouble with that. His experts have been working on the matter but have not been able to come up with anything that would be accepted by the administration, Congress, management and labor. Of course they haven't. And they never will. For the purpose of such legislation must be to protect the public interest, not to make everybody happy—even in an election year.

Presidential hand-wringing may have its place. But not in this situation. What is needed now is to get a bill drafted. A bit of the arm-twisting, for which the President is renowned, would produce one in a hurry.

Tax Concession for Commissioned Officers in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I recommend passage of a bill I have introduced today which would increase from $200 to $500 the monthly amount of the pay of a commissioned officer in the Armed Forces of the United States serving in southeast Asia, which is exempt from income tax.

Under present law, tax exemptions can sometimes operate to the disadvantage of commissioned officers, as compared with enlisted men. For the enlisted man in the combat zone, there is no limit on the amount of his income which is exempt from the income tax. But there is a $200 limit to the exemption which a commissioned officer can claim. Thus, there can arise a situation where a top enlisted man would be earning more than $200 a month, all of which would be tax exempt, while a commissioned officer earning over $200 a month would be exempt only up to that amount, and would not be receiving the same tax benefit as the enlisted man. This bill would give the commissioned officer an exemption up to $500, almost obviating any case where an enlisted man would be receiving a better tax break than the commissioned officer.

I commend this bill to my colleagues, as a means of correcting the present inequitable situation.

Black Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Amsterdam News is the largest Negro newspaper in the largest city in America and is easily one of the most influential newspapers for 20 million black Americans.

In its July 21 edition, the Amsterdam News published a front-page editorial titled "Black Power Is Self-Defense."

The editorial is signed by Dr. C. B. Powell, editor, and James L. Hicks, executive editor, two of the outstanding names in American journalism, black or white.

This editorial does a great deal, I believe, to clarify much of the misunderstanding on this dynamic new concept in American race relations. I have issued several statements on black power since I first used the term in a baccalaureate address at Howard University.

I think my colleagues will find this reasoned analysis of black power of great interest.

BLACK POWER IS SELF DEFENSE

Black power (Amsterdam News definition) is all acts of self defense by black men to force white city, state and Federal governments to comply with the civil rights laws guaranteed by the Federal Government and the Constitution of the United States.

Can any fair-minded American quarrel with this right of a black American to defend his home, his family, his Church?

We don't think so.

Yet where is there an American who does not recall Medgar Evers being shot dead in the back in the carport of his own home because God made him black?

Who is there who does not recall young Emmett Till being dragged from the arms of his family to be lynched in the dead of night because God made him black?

And who will ever forget four little Negro girls being blown to bits by a bigot's bomb as they sat in their church waiting for their Sunday School lessons . . . all because God made them black?

For 300 years the Negro in America has given his blood, sweat, tears and his very life to the building of this country. Even today, in Viet Nam, although he is only ten percent of the nation's population, he is 14% of our fighting forces over there and is 16% of those dying to preserve democracy.

Does any fair-minded American expect Negroes to endure such injustices indefinitely because God made them black?

We don't think so.

When Negroes make up such a great part of America's war power 12,000 miles from home, fighting to bring democracy to ten million Vietnamese, can any American object to a Negro's demands for a decent home, purposeful education for his children, a job with a living wage and equality under the law?

In this connection we thank God for the way the Supreme Court is upholding the law and the Constitution under Chief Justice Warren.

The Negro has paid his dues for full equality in America and America owes him a debt—and that debt, unless paid, will hang over the head of this nation as long as there is an America. There can be no escape from it.

How can the Negro obtain payment of this debt?

In order to obtain payment of this debt after 300 years of promises the Negro needs the help and strength of all other Americans just as all other Americans need the strength and help of the Negro.

For, despite its racial troubles, the United States is a nation of one people, and the Negro, representing only ten percent of the population, must never be deluded into thinking he can "go it alone" and force his will on the majority.

Nor can he afford to complacently accept persecution and abuse as an "outsider."

The Negro is an "insider." He is an integral part of an indivisible nation and he must never forget it.

He is not alone as an American, and his past history and future destiny have been and will be worked out in America through mutual coexistence with other Americans, working for a better America.

Thus the Negro needs the contributions of all black men and all black organizations in working toward his goal. He needs Dr. Martin Luther King of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, who can be compared to a "modern day Moses" attempting to lead his people out of the wilderness.

He also needs the leadership and contributions of Congressman Adam Clayton Powell; Roy Wilkins of the NAACP; Jack Greenberg, head of the NAACP Legal and Educational Defense Fund; A. Philip Randolph, the elder statesman; Whitney Young of the National Urban League; J. Raymond Jones, the political leader; Floyd McKissick of CORE; Miss Dorothy Height of the National Council of Negro Women; James Farmer, the ex-CORE leader; Stokely Carmichael of SNCC; James Lawson of the Black Nationalist Movement; Elijah Muhammad of the Black Muslims; and business leaders such as A. T. Spaulding of the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Company; T. M. Alexander of Atlanta; Joseph Davis, president, Carver Federal Savings and Loan Association; John H. Johnson, editor and publisher of Ebony Magazine; Carl Murphy, publisher Afro-American newspapers, and all other Negroes.

The solution of the Negro's problems also requires the leadership and contributions of that great reservoir of fair-minded white Americans in this country who have already contributed so much to the Negro's progress.

We refer to such men as President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY, Senators KENNEDY, JAVITS, DOUGLAS and DIRKSEN, Governor Rockefeller, former Mayor Wagner and Mayor Lindsay, and thousands of others including the courageous students, many of whom have given their lives for the cause.

All these people know that America owes a great debt to the Negro and they are the ones who stand ready to help America pay off that debt.

What the rest of this nation must now realize is that 22 million Negroes, keenly aware that this debt has been outstanding for more than 300 years, are now demanding payment, regardless of the consequences.

These Negroes know their rights and they know the laws passed by whites which guarantee them life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

They can no longer be fooled by persuasion and clever promises.

For, as Abraham Lincoln has so aptly said:

"You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

Wake up America and remain great!

C. B. POWELL, M.D.,
Editor.
JAMES L. HICKS,
Executive Editor.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have this opportunity to rise in the commemoration of the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. It is a week dedicated to bolster the determination and longing for freedom of the peoples in those many nations which have been tightly yoked under Communist oppression and intolerance. Compassion for the plight of these captive peoples is difficult for us Americans to fully feel, I fear, Mr. Speaker. The heritage of freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom to worship is taken all too nonchalantly nowadays. It is easy for us to let our memories and our hearts gloss over the blood and the sweat and the tears that have embossed the pages of American history with our world fight for freedom.

As a sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 395, which I introduced on April 3, 1965, to give hope to the Baltic States in their sorrowful predicament, I am convinced that the annual Captive Nations Week can be a highly effective assistance in the movement toward independence in the Eastern European countries.

The various totalitarian Communist governments do not represent the downtrodden, underlying captive nations. A force that can help to penetrate this Communist barrier which separates the captive peoples from the realization of their long quest for freedom is an institution like Captive Nations Week. This week and others like it over the years will give courage to those who might otherwise lose all hope. It will serve as a reminder of freedom where heretofore the only reminder of freedom lay deeply submerged in the consciousness of a generation which once knew the joys of freedom but is rapidly aging under the yoke of totalitarianism.

The purpose of Captive Nations Week, and indeed the purpose of all free nations, should be the construction of a bridge of understanding sympathy. We should provide moral support and exert all possible efforts to help set free from Communist colonialism these oppressed and tyrannized captive nations.

When one reads of the shameful accusations by the Sino-Soviets of Yankee imperialism and compares them with the facts that are so incontrovertible, it is perfectly clear that Russia and China are the last two remnants that remain of the world's backward centers of colonial conquest.

The free world and those in bondage who learn for the free exercise of their former freedoms, look to the United States for leadership. They look upon the United States as their last citadel of hope, their last bastion for the cause of freedom. While we continue to remain strong, and champion the cause of those who are free and those who yearn to be free, we must continuously assert our leadership in that respect. Such leadership lies not only in the diplomatic and foreign policy efforts of free governments around the world but also in commemorations of freedom such as Captive Nations Week. This I believe to be the chief raison d'etre of the principles upon which this great Nation of ours is constructed.

A Letter From Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. MAHON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. E. C. Hogan, Sr., of Post, Tex., recently sent me a letter which she received from her nephew, Royce S. Bolding, who is serving in the Navy in Vietnam, indicating that she would like to share it with other Americans. The American people owe a great debt of gratitude to the young men who serve our country in Vietnam, and I would like for others to have the opportunity of reading Mr. Bolding's letter also. I am, therefore, submitting excerpts from his letter of July 1, 1966, for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> Before I arrived here two months ago I wondered just what the heck did we want to fight over Viet-Nam for! Well, it didn't take this farm boy long to see what we were doing here—all I had to do was look around me—and I was proud of what my country was doing and much more so to be a part of it. These people here have been at a war of one sort or the other for over 30 years and have finally attained a semblance of a partial peace. In other words, they have more freedom now than they have ever known before. After working with them, visiting in their homes and fighting with them, I marvel at their determination and the great lengths they are willing to go to keep this newly found freedom. I have many Viet-Namese friends and really think they are great people.
>
> Of course, all things can't always have only a bright side and it seems to me the home papers always manage to print the grim side of things. Granted the demonstrations, etc., that we had here not so long ago were truly very discouraging, but from an eye-witness's viewpoint here is how I look at it. Most of the Vietnamese are very uneducated. By this I mean they do not have the schooling or even the facilities to teach all the peasants here. I find that this class plus teenaged kids were for the most part the main body of these demonstrations. The kids were in it mostly for kicks, as when else would they ever have a chance to throw a rock, break a window, etc. There is no doubt also in my mind that there were North Vietnamese inspired to add to all this.
>
> Just a little on the makeup of the land here. There are over 2,000 miles of navigable waterways in the delta alone during the monsoon season, and most of the land is either steaming hot jungles, rice paddies or mountains. Life is sheer hell here for the American, who is so used to his plush living, eating, and in general all his habits that he really suffers. However, after seeing one of these little kids break into a big smile and say, "You number 1 G.I.," it is worth every-

thing one has to offer. I believe in everything that I am doing and will give my all—as I feel this is a true threat to my family's freedom as well as my country's, and I will defend our flag as long as I am able and will always feel I have saved my children from going through the "hell" these kids are here.

Defense Pattern Alarming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, increasingly expressions of concern are being heard across the Nation concerning the adequacies of defense planning by the administration.

One such expression of concern is contained in the July 20, 1966, issue of the Glendale, Calif., News-Press.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the Glendale News-Press editorial for inclusion in the RECORD. I believe the position taken in the editorial and in the comments it contains will be of interest to the Congress:

NEW SHORTAGE IS OLD STORY: DEFENSE PATTERN ALARMING

Testimony of Gen. James P. McConnell, Air Force chief of staff, that the Tactical Air Command is down to "bedrock" in strength sends a ripple of alarm through the nation.

General McConnell says the shortages are so serious that trouble elsewhere than Viet Nam would result in a call-up of the Air National Guard and disrupt vital training.

It is not a new story so far as the Defense Department has been concerned recently.

There have been persistent and verified shortages of vehicles, helicopters, aircraft parts, certain weight bombs and even clothing in Viet Nam. A Senate subcommittee, after a study, listed 29 items in short supply in the critical war area.

The shortages were verified after vehement dissent from Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, who labeled such information "baloney." "Never have ground operations been so well supported by air," he said. True, perhaps, but an evasion of the fact that supplies were short.

Later, after newspaper reports and investigations by members of congress it was learned that fully half of the four U.S. combat divisions in the United States were not ready for combat, but engaged in training. All "ready reserve" battalions were earmarked for Viet Nam or other U.S. commitments.

Then, at the height of a crisis in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the secretary of defense withdrew 15,000 troops, mostly highly skilled technicians, from Europe without first consulting our allies. The withdrawal came shortly after his comment that it is "absolutely false to say we are overextended and cannot meet our military requirements."

Additionally, of course, Congress and key military leaders are concerned that there is no anti-missile defense in operation, that no program exists for a follow-up bomber to the obsolescent B–52, at cutbacks in the Strategic Air Command and refusal of the Defense Department to construct nuclear frigates authorized by Congress to speed a nuclear surface Navy.

The pattern is clear evidence that, regardless of Mr. McNamara's background of management, the matter of defense is too critical to be left to the decisions of a single man. No one should have this kind of power. Rather, defense should be a co-operative effort that includes Congress and the experienced wisdom of our military leaders.

Only time and a careful analysis of the secretary's claim that he has saved $14 billion in defense over the last four years will prove whether this is fact.

It can be said now, however, that "savings" are a misnomer if the nation's defenses have been weakened or a war effort is slowed down by a lack of supplies.

Wars cannot be fought with short supplies and a missile that has not been built cannot be fired.

How the Vietnam Problem Was Neatly Solved, or * * *

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIM LEE CARTER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the Saturday Evening Post often carries thought-provoking articles. In the issue of July 30, 1966, I found this interesting observation of the Vietnam situation, written by Russell Baker:

THE HUMAN COMEDY: HOW THE VIETNAM PROBLEM WAS NEATLY SOLVED, OR * * *

(By Russell Baker)

Until 10:32 p.m. when the direct phone from Saigon rang in the White House, September 17, 1971, had been just another day in Washington.

Once again President Johnson had urged the nation to be patient about the Vietnamese war. Secretary of Defense McNamara that afternoon had issued his semiannual declaration that the Viet Cong were no longer winning.

At the State Department, Secretary Rusk had assured the press that despite widespread riots and library burnings, there was every reason to believe that Gen. Quang Cai Quec, who had seized power three weeks before, would at last give South Vietnam a long period of governmental stability.

Mr. Rusk said that Gen. Quec might even agree soon to take some of the South Vietnamese army out of pagodas and put them into battle alongside the Americans.

The White House phone call was from the American ambassador. "General Quec wants an island," he said.

The presidential jet touched down at Honolulu 36 hours later. "What's this about an island?" the President asked Gen. Quec.

While the President and his advisers listened, the general explained. On the night of September 16, unable to get to sleep, he had slipped down to the kitchen of the presidential palace for a midnight snack, only to discover that the Viet Cong terrorists had been there just minutes before him and raided the icebox.

To govern a country under such conditions, he reasoned, was impossible. "You can't drive outside town without being kidnapped," he said. "The pagodas are packed with politicians, and there are so many overpaid GI's in Saigon that a premier can't even get a bad table in a restaurant anymore without slipping some piasters to the maitre d'. The trouble is that South Vietnam is located in the wrong place."

"Keep talking," said the President.

"I have loaded every available sampan with elements of my army," Gen. Quec said. "I propose to move offshore to the Republic of Nationalist Vietnam, where we can rally our strength for a victorious return to the mainland."

"And just where is the Republic of Nationalist Vietnam?" asked Mr. Rusk.

Gen. Quec smiled. "How about Catalina Island?" he asked.

Next morning, while Gen. Quec inspected Waikiki beach, the President's advisers came to grips with the question of Nationalist Vietnam. They stayed at grips all day, all the next day, and all through the day after that.

On the morning of the fourth day their conference was interrupted by Gen. Quec with the announcement that the first sampans carrying his army has beached on the island of Mai Tai, 60 miles off the Vietnamese coast, had seized Cum Quat, the capital, and had proclaimed it the seat of the Republic of Nationalist Vietnam.

"If you will excuse me, I must now meet with the press and vow to return to the mainland one of these days," Gen. Quec said.

"It will never work, General," said Secretary Rusk. "Look at what happened to Chiang Kai-shek."

The papers reported that Gen. Quec excused himself and exited laughing.

Instead of flying immediately to Cum Quat, Gen. Quec accepted a series of speaking engagements in the United States, where news of his stirring pledge to return to the mainland one of these days had made him an overnight hero.

Landing in San Francisco to a tumultuous reception, Quec promised that if the United States would only unleash him, he would send the Nationalist Vietnam Army lunging across of Gulf of Tonkin to provide military advisers to American armies and clear the Communists off the mainland.

For that eventual triumph, he told a joint session of Congress, the Republic of Nationalist Vietnam on Mai Tai would require massive American aid. Cum Quat, after all, was still only a provisional island town, he noted. It needed new factories and bomber strips. Vast sums would be required to build a Cum Quat Hilton and air-condition Cum Quat's bars for U.S. military, diplomatic, and aid teams when they arrived to defeat Communism.

Meanwhile, at the White House, the President's advisers struggled with the Mai Tai problem. "The question," said a man from Texas, "is whether we are are going to recognize Mai Tai as Vietnam."

"Unthinkable," said Secretary Rusk. "Mai Tai is only a two-bit island sixty miles off the Asian mainland."

"Impossible," said Secretary McNamara. "We already have a million-and-a-half American soldiers tied down on the mainland."

The man from Texas winked. "Suppose we stopped recognizing Vietnam as Vietnam," he said. "Suppose we said that the real Vietnam is on Mai Tai. What do we do with our soldiers?"

"Well," said Secretary Rusk, "since we are fighting to preserve the freedom of Vietnam, we would, of course, have to locate the soldiers wherever Vietnam may be."

"That would mean taking them off the mainland and putting them on Mai Tai," said Secretary McNamara.

Next day the United States announced that it had recognized the Republic of Nationalist Vietnam on Mai Tai and did not recognize anyplace else that called itself Vietnam.

At his news conference Mr. Rusk was asked if Americans would continue to fight on the mainland. "Since we do not recognize any Vietnam on the mainland, your question is absurd," he explained. "Obviously an army cannot preserve the freedom of a place that does not exist."

Which, as we all know, is how the fighting in Vietnam—mainland Vietnam, that is—finally ended. For a while it was expensive maintaining the American army on

Mai Tai and converting Cum Quat into a place where Gen. Quang Cai Quec could live comfortably. With time, however, the job was done, the soldiers came home, and the Great Society was begun in earnest.

In his memoirs the President wrote that the only bad advice he received during the Mai Tai crisis came from the Secretary of the Treasury, who told him, "Mr. President, the one thing this country cannot afford is another Quang Cai Quec."

"History," wrote the President, "has proved him wrong. As long as we in this country can keep Asia confined to islands, we can live with it."

Horton Urges United States To Heed Prime Minister Pearson's Warning on Weakening NATO, Support for Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this will be the third time this year that I have stood before my colleagues in this Chamber to discuss the urgent need for American initiative in the Atlantic alliance. In the past few months, with NATO undergoing turbulence and change, our foreign policy makers have responded passively at best to the initiatives of European governments. Our most recent move was the announcement of a wholesale withdrawal of U.S. military units from France. There is no evidence that our Government views the obvious weakening of the alliance with any appropriate degree of concern. Even more alarming is the fact that outside of Congress, no one in Washington has taken any serious steps to plan for strengthening the alliance.

I believe that our leaders have made a tacit decision to step down from active and enlightened leadership of the North Atlantic nations. This fact became clear when the administration failed to react to Canada Prime Minister Pearson's speech in Springfield, Ill., last month, which was highly critical of America's failure to lead the alliance toward eventual Atlantic Union. Mr. Pearson said:

> France and not only France feels that Continental Europe is now strong enough to be given its rightful share in the control of the policies of the alliance.

Despite the fact that the United States of all nations should be aware of the changes in the international order since 1945, our NATO policies have remained nearly unchanged since the alliance was founded.

I am disturbed not only because there was no administration response to the Prime Minister's address, but also because Mr. Pearson hit on the weakest points of our Atlantic policies, and suggested the best possible course of action to strengthen the alliance. Our failure to respond indicates to me a lack of interest in improving the alliance. How can we while we are pursuing a conflict in southeast Asia to contain communism, fail to bolster the NATO organization which has been so successful in keeping Western Europe free without war?

My good friend and colleague, Congressman Paul Findley of Illinois, thought enough of the Prime Minister's address to insert it into the Congressional Record. I want to add my own support to Mr. Findley's proposal to actively consider the concept of Atlantic Union as a solution to the present trend of the NATO Alliance. I have introduced House Joint Resolution 999 to provide for U.S. participation in an Atlantic Union Convention with delegations from the other North Atlantic countries.

I think the need for such a move could not be stated more meaningfully than it was in the Prime Minister's own words:

> I believe only the United States can give the effective lead required for Atlantic unity. Without her active support nothing can be done, at least on the broad front which is essential. Without her leadership we will be driven back to a national or continental solution for the organization of security and for progress.

We cannot in conscience let this matter drop with passive American gestures at rebuilding the alliance. Only a few nights ago, I spoke about the need for new dimensions in our Atlantic policy to a large audience in Rochester, N.Y. Their concern for this matter was evident, as all Americans who cherish the unity of the free world are concerned about the weakening trend in our ties to Western Europe.

I urge my colleagues to study this matter closely, and to join Representative Findley and myself in demanding an appropriate and constructive response to Prime Minister Pearson's remarks on the future of NATO.

At this point in the Record, I want to include three newspaper articles which point up the need for new directions in our free world foreign policy. The three newspapers, the Montreal Star, the New York Times, and the Baltimore Sun, are to be commended for their responsible reporting on this issue:

[From the Montreal (Canada) Star, June 16, 1966]

Pearson Speech: White House Silence Follows Criticism

(By Raymond Heard)

Washington.—Diplomats and interested members of Congress can't understand it. Lester Pearson came to the United States Saturday to attack American "domination" of the Atlantic Alliance. Yet there has been no reaction to the speech from the Johnson administration, which is very sensitive to criticism from its foreign friends.

However, it is predicted that the speech—regarded by many here and in Ottawa as one of the most outspoken anti-American declarations of Mr. Pearson's career—will have a delayed action effect. Sooner or later, the word will seep through to Lyndon Johnson that his "good neighbor" is behaving toward Washington rather like the Romanians are behaving toward Moscow.

As it is, to generate wider interest in the speech, Republican representative Paul Findley of Illinois has inserted the text into the Congressional Record. Mr. Findley has also told this reporter: "There should have been a full debate here on the prime minister's speech. His remarks were both plain and wise. I can't recall an occasion when a foreign head of government has spoken quite so critically while on American ground."

FINDS SYMPATHY

Sen. Frank Church, the Idaho Democrat who went to Europe last month to inquire into the NATO crisis for Sen. J. W. Fulbright's Foreign Relations Committee, has asked for a copy of Mr. Pearson's text. When Sen. Church conducts hearings into the NATO question later this month, the Pearson statement is expected to figure prominently in the discussion. For Mr. Pearson has suggested (among other things) that de Gaulle's complaints about U.S. domination of the alliance may be quite valid after all, and Sen. Church, too, is reported to agree that the French president may have a point.

There is, meantime, some evidence that President Johnson has neither seen the Pearson speech nor heard about it, that the state department or the presidential aides, in the words of one Capitol Hill source, are hiding it from his view.

At a White House ceremony Tuesday for the signing of a bill authorizing the construction of a new dam for the Columbia River project, the president referred to Mr. Pearson as "my good friend." Johnson-watchers say that if the president had been aware of what Mr. Pearson had said in Springfield, Ill., Saturday he would not have paid him such a warm tribute. This may sound petty; but that's the way LBJ operates.

In his speech to the Atlantic Federal Union, the prime minister placed a major share of the blame for the current disarray of NATO on the United States rather than France, which the Johnson administration has cast in the role of "bad guy."

"France," the prime minister said, "is not, has not, and will not be satisfied with an Atlantic organization, or an Atlantic alliance of independent states dominated by America." His choice of the term "dominated" is regarded as very strong, at least for a professional diplomat of Mr. Pearson's experience.

Mr. Pearson made another remark that is sure to gall the president when he equated Washington's dominant position in NATO with that of Russia in the Warsaw Pact.

EARLIER TIFF

The total lack of an administration response (even in the way of inspired reports quoting "administration sources") to the Pearson speech is all the more surprising when viewed in the light of the Johnson-Pearson tiff over Viet Nam tactics at Camp David 14 months ago. The Prime Minister offended Mr. Johnson then by suggesting, ever so discreetly, that bombing of North Viet Nam might be suspended at "the right time."

If Mr. Pearson's remarks on Viet Nam last year gave comfort to the "doves," his Springfield speech about NATO has encouraged those in Congress, most of whom appear to be Republicans, who favor an Atlantic union and a more "realistic" attitude toward de Gaulle.

Rep. Findley, who, as representative for Springfield was one of Mr. Pearson's hosts Saturday, is dedicating himself to arguing the need for an Atlantic community bound together with federal ties. Utopian as his goal may seem, he counts such major Republicans as Dwight Eisenhower and Barry Goldwater among his supporters, as well as the former NATO commander, Gen. Lauris Norstad.

GOP SUPPORT

Mr. Findley finds too, that Republican support in Congress and at the grass-roots level, even in the supposedly isolationist Midwest, for his Atlantic dream is growing fast as the impasse with France escalates.

On Saturday Mr. Pearson paralleled the view of the Findleyite Republicans when he called on Washington to take the lead in establishing a closer Atlantic alliance, less dominated by U.S. authority. Perhaps this is the reason for the strange official silence of the Johnson administration to Mr. Pearson's provocative remarks.

The president may not have been informed of the import of Mr. Pearson's speech. But there are others in the administration who fear that to answer the prime minister would give the Republicans ammunition to suggest that Mr. Johnson's leadership of the West has become so poor that even America's closest friends, the Canadians, are complaining.

[From the New York Times, June 12, 1966]

NATO Substitute Urged by Pearson—Says United States Should Show Way to Revitalized Alliance

Springfield, Ill., June 11.—Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson of Canada urged here tonight that the United States lead the way in establishing a new, revitalized Atlantic alliance to replace what he described as the outdated North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Whether or not the organization survive the crisis precipitated by the French military withdrawal, he said the Atlantic powers must move forward to "an international community with common political institutions."

"An alliance for defense only is an anachronism in the world of 1966," the Prime Minister declared.

In an address purpose for an Atlantic Union dinner in the Leland Hotel, Mr. Pearson obliquely critized the United States for not acting sooner to alter "an Atlantic alliance of independent states, dominated by America."

"France, and not only France, feels that continental Europe is now strong enough to be given its rightful share in the control of the policies of the alliance" declared the Prime Minister, who won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1957.

Earlier in the day, Mr. Pearson received an Atlantic Union at a ceremony in New Salem State Park, where the village of New Salem has been restored as it was when Abraham Lincoln ran a store there. The award was presented by Clarence Strett, president of Federal Union, Inc. This is a private organization that has worked for many years to bring European and North American states together in federation. Christion Herter, former Secretary of State, also was given an Atlantic Union peace award. The late Adlai E. Stevenson, who was the chief United States delegate to the United Nations, also was honored with a peace award.

CITES DOUBT AND DISTRUST

Prime Minister Pearson said that the Atlantic powers had worked together enthusiastically in the trying days after World War II but had developed "impatience and doubt and some distrust" after the recovery of Europe. NATO, he suggested, had fallen victim to "intertia and vested interest in a new status quo."

He said Canada, since 1964, had tried without success "to find anyone . . . on either side of the Atlantic . . . prepared to specify what should be changed (in NATO)."

Change at last was occurring only because "abrupt and unilateral action by France thrust change upon us," he said.

Mr. Pearson disagreed with the nationalist motives of President de Gaulle in taking France out of the defense alliance. But he suggested it was "dangerous" to rail at General de Gaulle for demanding for France "a position in the Atlantic alliance equal to that of Great Britain and somewhat closer to that of the United States." Rather, Mr. Pearson said, the Atlantic power must find a way to enable France to participate "in the march to greater not less Atlantic unity."

The way, he suggested, would be to build toward Atlantic unity by first giving Europe "more control . . . of its direction and its character."

"I realize," he said, "that the united Europe would, in its political, economic and military decisions, be more independent of Washington than is the case now.

"But what is wrong with this?" he asked.

A realistic approach to Atlantic union, he said, would be to accept a united Europe, Britain, "not as an obstacle to, but as a stage on the way to Atlantic union.

"If we cannot at present achieve a pattern of Atlantic federalism," he said, "it may be necessary to acknowledge the realities of the situation and, as North Americans, work with Europeans in the hope that, in the longer sweep of history, both European and North America will come to realize that their respective affairs can best be harmonized in a wider union.

"If an intervening European stage is necessary, however, it must be taken not in continental isolation but in close Atlantic cooperation and understanding.

He added that he felt that "continentalism, either of the European or North American variety is not the answer."

Finally I believe "only the United States can give the effective lead required for Atlantic unity," he said. Without her active participation and support nothing can be done, at least on the broad front which is essential. Without her leadership we will be driven back to a national or continental solution for the organization of security and for progress."

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, May 30, 1966]

Panel Urges Community of Democracies—State Department Held Slow To Face Need for Larger Unity

(By Joseph R. L. Sterne)

Washington, May 29.—North American and European countries were urged today to give up part of their national sovereignty in building an Atlantic community that eventually could grow into a worldwide "community of democracies."

The National Planning Association said Americans—and the State Department—have been too slow in facing up to the positive requirements needed in the construction of a more secure order.

This group of influential leaders in business, labor, agriculture and the professions contended that the Atlantic nations must be prepared to create a common organization that could integrate their foreign and defense policies.

NO VETO POWER

Following a pattern established by the six-nation European Common Market, decisions could be made on the basis of a "weighted vote" that, in effect, would deny the United States the veto power it now holds in the United Nations and NATO.

At the outset, the proposed Atlantic Community Organization would have the powers necessary to raise appropriations to carry out foreign and defense policies.

Economic integration and the knotty problem of freedom of migration, would come later, under the National Planning Association formula.

In addition, the Atlantic community would not be an exclusive "club." As conditions permit and agreement is reached, democracies in Africa, Asia, and Latin America would be added.

FEDERAL PATTERN

The association said the proposed international organization should be based upon the Federal pattern followed when the thirteen American colonies formed the United States.

Certain powers now exercised by the individual nation-states would be delegated to the "community," an agency with supranational powers.

In a report entitled "Strengthening the Free World through Steps toward Atlantic Unification," the N.P.A. board and its standing committees argued that the "limitations" of the nation-state are obvious in a world threatened by nuclear weapons.

MORE EVOLUTION NEEDED

The United Nations and NATO were expressions of a growing trend toward "interdependence" and "community," it said, but more "evolution" is needed.

"Along with the feeling of loyalty Americans have always had toward their city or town, their state and their country, they will have to develop an additional loyalty toward a larger political entity," said the report.

"For the people of the United States, however, the price will not be paid in the loss of their sovereignty. In a democracy, sovereignty is the possession of its citizens: the governments they create are only their agents. . . .

"The sovereign citizens of a democracy can entrust certain functions to entities other than national governments without 'sacrificing' or 'losing' any of the sovereignty they possess.

"They lose nothing, and may gain much, by delegating powers to a new agent when the existing agency cannot adequately serve their interests in peace, freedom and economic welfare."

The National Planning Association said an integrated Atlantic community could be created "around" France if President Charles de Gaulle continues his nationalistic policies.

Once Europe and North America are united, it said, there will be a sufficient concentration of military power to secure peace and a sufficient concentration of economic strength to bring real improvements in the living standards of less developed nations.

At a press conference last week in which today's report was discussed in advance of publication, top officials of the N.P.A. expressed disappointment over the State Department's attitude toward Atlantic community.

Elmo Roper, the public opinion expert and a member of the association's board, summarized the department's attitude as: "It's a fine idea, but not now."

Roper noted that Senate support for the concept is rising.

In 1946, only the last Estes Kefauver favored the community idea. Now, he said, Senators Gore (D., Tenn.), Case (R., N.J.), Cooper (R., Ky.), McGee (D., Wyo.), Church (D., Idaho), Kuchel (R., Cal.), Javits (R., N.Y.), McCarthy (D., Minn.) and others support bills pending before Congress.

Airline Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, "Public patience is wearing thin," so ends the following editorial from the Bristol, Tenn., Herald-Courier, which speaks out on the present airline strike.

Everyone's patience is being stretched to its limits by this disregard for the public welfare. I do not wish to see the Federal Government take control of the airlines, but I do urge that lawful means be used to end this strike, and, if necessary, that stricter laws be enacted to prevent this from happening again.

I wholeheartedly agree with this editorial, and I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD:

STRIKES ARE WEARING PUBLIC PATIENCE THIN

Do you have the feeling that the public is sick and tired of being the whipping boy in management-labor disputes?

The airline strike, for example.

Or the New York subway strike.

Or transportation strikes. Or any work stoppage which poses a threat to public health or security or seriously affects public convenience or economy.

Are you wondering why some way can't be found to put a stop to such nonsense?

This is not to suggest that all strikes should be outlawed. Labor has the right and the obligation to stand up and fight for what it believes it should have. So has management. And the strike is a key element in any such dispute.

The effects of some strikes are largely confined to those directly involved. Other strikes, unfortunately, work real hardships on thousands and even millions of innocent bystanders.

We already have laws which are supposed to prevent this. They seem to be blandly, even enthusiastically, ignored. They also seem to be unenforceable.

Surely, some way can be found to handle a problem as big as this.

And the sooner, the better. Public patience is wearing thin.

Weapon Against Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, by signing the freedom of information bill, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette declares, President Johnson established in law the important principle of the public's right of access to nonsensitive government data.

Its effectiveness will depend on the spirit in which the law is accepted, the newspaper comments.

In this regard, the President has called upon members of his administration to honor its intent even before it takes effect a year hence.

I include the Post-Gazette editorial in the RECORD:

WEAPON AGAINST SECRECY

President Johnson's signing of a freedom of information bill establishes in law the important principle of the public's right of access to certain government data and provides a hitherto unavailable method of forcing disclosure.

The new statute climaxes long efforts by the press and a few members of Congress to devise a means to keep government officials from arbitrarily withholding information in order to cover up mistakes or wrongdoing and thus avoid embarrassment and criticism. It requires federal executive agencies to disclose to inquiring citizens or reporters information which they have heretofore been able to keep secret under existing ambiguous rules. Though certain kinds of sensitive information may still be withheld under the new act, the measure provides for judicial review of government decisions to refuse disclosure.

Whatever the merits of the law, however, its general effectiveness will still depend on the spirit in which it is accepted by government officials. President Johnson has called upon members of his administration to honor the intent of the legislation even before it goes into effect a year from now. The months ahead, therefore, may reveal a fresh respect for freedom of information. But the real test will not come until somebody in government faces possible embarrassment and the law can be invoked against him.

Introduction to Newsday Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, recent events have sharpened focus upon the glaring weakness of present Federal and State laws regulating the accounting of campaign funds. Last Monday, Long Island Newsday ran an editorial which endorsed President Johnson's proposals for stricter regulation of campaign spending. Under unanimous consent, I include this succinct editorial in the RECORD:

PAYING FOR POLITICS

It takes more than ability, integrity or even a charming smile to win election to public office. It takes money. And as campaigning grows more and more expensive, the need for answers to some of the questions surrounding campaign financing grows more and more urgent.

The questions are both ethical and practical. How much should a candidate spend? From whom should he solicit funds? What accounting of campaign funds should be rendered? It is not difficult to pose the questions. Framing the answers is a different matter. The lawmakers in 43 states have grappled with the problem and produced 43 different attempts to solve it. The result, according to a study done by the Citizens Research Foundation under a Carnegie Corporation grant, is a "hodgepodge."

The state laws, in general, are riddled with loopholes, inconsistent, unenforceable and unenforced. New York State, for example, requires that reports on campaign spending be filed with the secretary of state. But the vague rules on spending limitations are easily evaded through the creation of exempt committees. And the filing of the reports has become a charade. The reports are generally always tucked away in a filing cabinet and forgotten. For all the good it does, the law might as well require the candidates to certify their purity with an accounting engraved in the air.

At the federal level, the situation is just as bad. The Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 requires House and Senate candidates to file campaign spending receipt and expenditure reports. But the act is so written that it is about as effective in catching corrupt practices as a fish net is in catching the wind. The act is a filigree of loopholes, including one that requires the candidates to report only that spending done with their "knowledge or consent."

This makes it unnecessary for many to try to evade the act. The great majority of candidates file incomplete reports secure in the legal fiction that the committees working in their behalf did so without their "knowledge or consent."

With such a so-called "law" on the books, it is easy to understand what President Johnson meant in May, when in proposing a new campaign expenditure law, he said: ". . . for decades we have tolerated the growth of seeds of cynicism from the underbrush surroundour present method of financing political campaigns."

Johnson's proposal, now in the Congress, has dual goals. It seeks stricter regulation of campaign spending and it seeks to aid the candidate who, because of a modest income might either have to forgo running for office or incur "obligations" to wealthy supporters. The bill provides for a nearly complete disclosure of the sources of campaign funds in both primary and general elections, puts a $5,000 limit on contributions from a single source to a single candidate and seeks to encourage small contributions by enabling donors to claim tax deductions of up to $100. The President's proposal has merit, and it deserves quick action in the Congress.

On the state level, a bill that attempted to put a ceiling on burgeoning campaign expenses passed the Assemby this spring and then went to a quiet death in a Senate committee. The bill had merit in that it set a limit of 10 cents that could be spent for each person in the area in which a candidate was running. It should have been passed.

What New York and the nation really need are full disclosure laws, without loopholes and with teeth.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened that it is necessary for us to observe Captive Nations Week. In this age, human slavery should be an anachronism—a condition of the forgotten past. Although we wish that all men were free, millions live enslaved.

In 1917, the Kerensky government of Russia fell victim to the Communists. Since then, the shackles of totalitarianism have bound 22 nations in Eastern Europe, Asia, and the Caribbean. The once free people of Albania, Armenia, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Cuba, East German, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, the Ukraine, and several other East European nations no longer breathe the sweet air of liberty. In not one of these countries did the Communists gain power through free elections. Subversion, deception and "Gestapo" tactics are their tools for conquest. In sharp contrast, the Western nations have freed over 50 former colonies since World War II. Only a blind fool could mistake the Communists for anything but imperialistic aggressors.

Since 1958, our Government has set aside the third week in July as Captive Nations Week. First, we should observe this week to mourn the dead who lost their lives attempting to throw off the chains of captivity.

Even more fervently, we mourn the living who yearn to be free. To these millions who look toward the West as a beacon torch of liberty, we must continually renew our pledge that we refuse to accept their plight as a permanent condition. We must demonstrate that self-determination is not a hollow cry, but a guiding principle.

I hope that the people of the emerging nations, in their search for freedom of the press, religion, assembly, and speech, listen attentively to the cries of these brave people. It should be difficult for any man to ignore the exodus from Communist East Berlin which had to be stopped with barbed wire, machineguns, and a forbidding wall. If the newly independent countries fail to heed such signs, the destiny of mankind will rest on shifting sands.

Today, it is impossible to disconnect foreign policy and domestic happenings. The events occurring in our cities and towns are seen by the whole world. The premises of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence must be fulfilled as soon as possible.

In the long run, our ability to aid and succor fellow men of the world in search of freedom is dependent on our own vitality. The dignity and worth of free men must be preserved. The shame of liberty must never be extinguished.

Thomas Jefferson's historic statement should become a universal oath: "I swear before the alter of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Jacksonville Harbor Grows—Funds Needed To Meet Defense, Economic Demands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Jacksonville, Fla., is a key city in the Atlantic coast defense of our country, as the home for three important naval installations. It is also the exit to the Atlantic for the St. Johns River, a vibrant and pulsing waterway serving millions of Americans, and eastern border of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

In the last year or two, through private initiative and local tax funds, the port of Jacksonville has developed into a major transportation center. The Jacksonville Port Authority is the local group with prime responsibility for the growth of the harbor and its facilities to serve the Navy bases and the booming Florida economy, including the latest discovery of huge phosphate deposits in North Florida. With the completion of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, even greater defense and business prosperity will evolve.

To meet these demands for the present and the future, the Jacksonville harbor must be deepened from 34 feet to 38 feet, and eventually greater depths, to handle the proposed new tankers that will have to service the Navy facilities and the businesses in industrial north Florida. The deepening project, totaling over $8 million, has been authorized by Congress. An item of $80,000 for preconstruction planning for the deepening of the harbor is now pending in Congress to begin this highly significant local-Federal project, which will benefit millions and which I hope will be approved.

I include in the Congressional Record a news report from the Journal of Commerce, Tuesday, July 19, 1966, which tells of this fine effort by Jacksonville and Florida citizens, who are utilizing the port of Jacksonville to the utmost:

NEW LOOK FOR JACKSONVILLE PIERS

Rebuilding of Jacksonville's antiquated Talleyrand Docks is to get under way about Aug. 1, with funds coming from a $35 million issue of general obligation bonds authorized by the voters of Duval County last November.

This will be the biggest project to date for the fledgling port authority. The Talleyrand Docks, formerly owned by the city, have been in a state of deterioration for almost 30 years a spokesman for the port agency said.

TO REPLACE OLD PIERS

In the rebuilding project, three old finger piers with small cargo sheds will be replaced by a marginal wharf with 4,600 lineal feet of berthing space backed up by four large warehouse-transit shed buildings, each 400 feet square.

Two of the six sides of the three existing piers have been unoperative for some time. Rebuilding the terminal will use up an estimated $15.7 million of the bond money. This amount was taken by a syndicate headed by Barnett First National Bank of Jacksonville and First National Bank of Miami, at a rate just under 4 per cent, with the Bankers Trust Co. of New York designated as payment agent.

"We look for actual work to begin around Aug. 1," said David A. Watts, port authority chairman and vice president of the Strachan Shipping Co. "Tearing down the old and reconstruction of our new docks will be done in a manner to allow continued operation of parts of the facilities at all times.

"In fact, taking over a pier recently released back to us by Sea-Land Service, Inc., makes it possible for us to continue operation with never any less space than we had in the past year."

Sea-Land formerly occupied one of the Tallyrand berths, but now has relocated at a new berth in Jacksonville. Its new terminal includes a shoreside crane and marshalling area for 350 trailer-type containers.

FUTURE PLANS

The port agency expects to sell the remaining $9.3 million of the bond issue at some future date to develop 1,500-acre Blount Island for port purposes. The island is several miles close to the open sea than are the Talleyrand Docks.

In its long-range planning, the port authority believes that something close to $100 million will be needed to rebuild and expand Jacksonville port facilities to handle the volume of business expected in the future, especially after completion of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

However, engineers and officials are convinced that the $75 million needed after the current bond issue is exhausted can come from part earnings or through revenue bonds.

Meanwhile, David W. Jackson, treasurer of the Jacksonville Port Authority and a charter member of its board when it was established four years ago, has been named a director of the Canal Authority of the State of Florida, replacing the late Harry W. Saunders of Port St. Joe.

The state body is in charge of construction of the Cross-Florida Canal. Mr. Jackson is staging manager for heavy equipment for B. B. McCormick and Sons, president of Jackson Marine Sales, and a former executive vice president of Gibbs Corp.'s Southside Shipyard.

Strange Words From Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, irresponsible statements by high Federal officials during the recent spate of racial riots throughout the country have dismayed many Americans.

The Richmond Palladium-Item, published in Richmond, Ind., commented editorially on July 24, concerning the inflamatory tirade delivered recently in New Orleans by the Vice President.

The Palladium-Item sums up in a concise manner the damage caused by such statements, and draws some other conclusions that should be considered by every Member of Congress.

The editorial follows:

STRANGE WORDS FROM VICE PRESIDENT

"I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt under those (slum) conditions."

The speaker was the vice president of the United States talking in New Orleans before the National Association of Counties.

Hubert Humphrey, the man who stands only a heart beat from the presidency, indirectly was justifying the burning, looting and killings that have reached epidemic proportions in cities across the face of this riot-scarred nation.

He had nothing to say about the store owners, Negro and white, who were wiped out by looters. He expressed no remorse at the innocent victims of mob savegery.

The vice president could only say that the rioters were frustrated because, unlike those who had worked hard to save money and enjoy the good things in life like swimming pools, they had to do without.

"That's all over," he said.

Later in the week, when repercussions began to arise over Humphrey's inflamatory remarks, the vice president did not deny what he was quoted as saying, but he insisted that he also had said that "we cannot condone violence, lawlessness and disorder."

This puts the vice president in a strikingly contradictory role. How can he speak in one breath about how he could "lead a mighty good revolt" and then turn around and say that "we cannot condone violence?"

The President has established a blue-ribbon committee to study the causes and preventions of crime. Riots, of course, are a form of mass crime against society and its laws.

Humphrey has come up with a solution to prevent riots. He said everybody should get subsidized housing so that, regardless of their personal efforts, they can live in nice homes, unless "you want violence in America."

One theory is that if you put a man in a good house he, too, will be good.

What about the gangs of young affluent punks who rumble nightly on the streets of major cities of America? They have been given all the advantages of money, and like the slum rioters, tear at the social fabric of the country.

Could it possibly be that punks and rioters rampage and destroy because they have never known self-discipline or respect for people and property, law and order? Is the dole, whether an unearned allowance or federal subsidy, the answer to a lack of civilized behavior?

The riots, lootings and other forms of violence going on now in one city after another, under the guise of seeking "civil rights," have been deplored by wiser leaders of the Negro race.

One might expect the more militant seekers of "black power" to condone this kind of action.

But it is dismayingly surprising to hear it from the lips of the man who holds the second highest office in the land.

Grand Canyon Advertisements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, an advertisement in the New York Times of July 25, 1966, regarding the ill-advised Grand Canyon Dam proposals, prompts me to express gratitude that conservationists are not giving up this fight.

After similar advertisements were published last month by the Sierra Club, the Internal Revenue Service delivered a warning to the club—perhaps with justification but certainly with unseemly haste—that its tax-deductible status was in question.

Not being intimidated by the IRS action, the Sierra Club is continuing to inform the public of this threat to the Grand Canyon.

In the meantime, the proposed dams have become linked in the public mind with misgivings as to IRS motives in the affair, as described in the following editorial from the Rockford, Ill., Morning Star, of June 24, 1966:

DAM WOULD MAR GRAND CANYON

Congress should waste no time in denying a Department of Interior bill to dam the Colorado River and ruin the Grand Canyon, one of the nation's most scenic natural spectacles.

The Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation wants authorization to build dams on the Colorado River, above and below the Grand Canyon. The dams would flood the entire length of the canyon and back flood waters 13 miles into Grand Canyon National Park.

Supporters of the bill, among them Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, contend the dams are needed to provide water for arid Arizona.

Not only is their position ridiculous, they have another far more productive motive in mind.

Water from the reservoirs created by the dam would not be piped to Arizona. It would be used to manufacture electrical power.

Part of the power would be used to pump water to Arizona from Lake Havasu, far down the Colorado River. The remainder would be sold to the public. This is why the dams have been called "cash registers" in literature circulated by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Eyed from every angle, the Bureau of Reclamation's proposal is asinine. There are alternative and cheaper methods of creating electrical power and better alternative sites to provide Arizona with the water it needs without filling the Grand Canyon with water.

One does not have to be a conservationist or nature lover to appreciate the grandeur of the Grand Canyon. It is a natural wonder that should be preserved, not inundated.

What's worse, a non-profit conservation group is in trouble up to its ears because it attempted to alert the public to the dangers posed by the pending dam measure.

The day after newspaper advertisements were sponsored by the Sierra Club, the Internal Revenue Service notified the club that as of that date contributions no longer would necessarily be regarded as tax deductible.

Under the law, an organization cannot enjoy tax-exempt status if it devotes a "substantial" portion of its efforts and income to politics or lobbying, but no standard definition of "substantial" has been offered by the IRS.

The IRS action establishes a dangerous precedent. It must be interpreted that any organization concerned with public issues could be similarly restrained by the threatened loss of tax exemption.

It is fair to assume that the IRS intervention against the Sierra Club at this time is more than coincidental. It smacks of harassment and intimidation. The curb was ordered without investigation or hearing.

The Bureau of Reclamation bill should be defeated. And a sharp look should be taken at IRS procedures which had the effect of muting opposition to this latest federal boondoggle.

Griffin Is Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who have served in the House of Representatives with the Honorable ROBERT P. GRIFFIN during the past five terms, there is none who doubted his ability, his integrity, and his intellect.

We are far from alone in this high praise of the gentleman from Michigan who now serves so ably in the other body.

Last Sunday, the Detroit News printed an editorial in praise of BOB GRIFFIN entitled "GRIFFIN Is Best."

For the benefit of my colleagues who know his considerable abilities and for the edification of those few who do not, the editorial follows:

[From the Detroit News, July 24, 1966]

IN THE U.S. SENATE RACE: GRIFFIN IS BEST

Michigan voters this year will choose between former Gov. G. Mennen Williams and Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh, both Democrats, to fill a seat in the U.S. Senate this year, or continue Republican Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN on the job.

Judged by past performance and future promise, Williams is by all odds the worst possible choice for Michigan, GRIFFIN the best.

That leaves Cavanagh in the middle. Initially he was put there by timing and circumstance. The determination of his party's last generation politico-labor bosses to perpetuate Williams and close the primary to a fresh face and new ideas kept him there. August Scholle has promised the nomination to his man and appears about to deliver.

Cavanagh entered the campaign on a wave of national praise for his aggressive, colorful performance in his first city hall term. Many called him the best mayor Detroit has had in two decades. With some current reservations as to his lack of concern about grand jury charges against his Police Department, we are inclined to believe he can achieve that standing.

But, as a Senate candidate, he has discarded the level-headed moderation which generally has featured his municipal administration.

His peace-at-any-price program for Vietnam, his call for diversion of union and corporate pension funds into low return urban housing loans, his assault on those spending curbs which President Johnson has imposed—all these items portray Cavanagh as a candidate willing to grab at any bit of demagogic nonsense which might produce his own bloc votes.

And, beyond this, there is the fact that most of Cavanagh's second four-year program for Detroit is in the promissory or transition stage. This newspaper believes his vigor and city administrative skill should be kept in Detroit. His future political promotion should be based on a record of final accomplishment.

Williams' is a jingoistic record of personal political advancement which cost Michigan's government 12 years of stalemate. He operated in such subservience to labor's political bosses within the state that outside of it he was pictured as the AFL–CIO's dancing bear in a polka dot collar.

His was an administration recorded in crisis headlines but achieving no progress. It brought Michigan near to bankruptcy. It achieved for Michigan the nationally recognized title of the "welfare state." It was funded in large part by raiding emergency moneys previously laid aside. Eventually even the Veterans Trust Fund was grabbed and an IOU left in the till.

Under Williams, the flight of industry from the Michigan economic climate, the rise of joblessness, the exhaustion of unemployment compensation benefits, all were documented. He left Michigan wallowing in deficit financing, the state's bonds selling at a poor risk level.

Williams boasts now of his part in the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy's judgment of Williams is best measured in the job he gave him. Williams was put in charge of African affairs in the State Department, a job so far removed from important policy making that it had been held previously by a civil servant.

Williams' claim to success in that assignment is best measured by counting the number of dependable friends this country has in Africa today.

Williams never has lost an election or solved a governmental problem. Nor does the format of his present campaign—the monotonous grin, the interminable handshaking, the refusal to debate the solid issues—indicate a promise of other than further frustration.

GRIFFIN is in refreshing contrast. He comes from a workingman's family—not a millionaire's—with more than a political interest in labor. A labor-management lawyer—a new breed in jurisprudence—he has walked the middle road and already has written that philosophy into labor law. He is young, but proven, with 10 years experience in Congress.

GRIFFIN is a Washington spokesman who will bring prestige to Michigan and cause the state no embarrassment abroad. He bears himself with decorum, makes decisions without favoritism. He has proven his ability to both follow and lead, the highest requisites of a good senator.

Michigan wants a doer in Washington, not a poseur. GRIFFIN promises to fill that bill the best of anyone since the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg. That is why this newspaper is urging that he be kept on the job.

Fair Break for Rehabilitated Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I testified before the Subcommittee on Military Discharges and Dismissals of the House Committee on Armed Services on a matter of great importance to a half million veterans.

I have introduced H.R. 15310, which would allow ex-servicemen, with less than honorable discharges, to mitigate the consequences of a misstep upon proof of rehabilitation. This does not interfere with military procedures. It does not alter their official records.

The prime purpose of the bill is to allow qualified persons an opportunity to earn a better employment opportunity and lead a more useful life for themselves and their families. Most of these veterans suffer employment difficulties far beyond what would be occasioned by the identical offense in civilian life. These men would be selected with great care; the Board would give careful thought to such an award and rightly so.

I feel strongly about this bill and I include my testimony in the RECORD:

I am happy to be here to testify on behalf of what I believe is most worthy legislation. I have introduced a bill, identical to one brought forward by the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, Hon. CHARLES BENNETT, which would authorize award of exemplary rehabilitation certificates to servicemen who have not received honorable discharges.

A questionable detachment from our armed services represents a black cloud which hangs over a man for the rest of his life. He carries a stigma wherever he goes. People in his community turn their backs upon him as soon as they find out about that discharge. Employers will not trust him. Our Federal Government will not help him, while it gladly and gratefully aids other veterans. Even his wife and children know there is shame in his past. Some men may successfully hide their pasts from others, yet they know within themselves that their record is not something to take pride in.

This is the plight of a half million men and women in our country. How tragic that a man cannot rid himself of this blot, regardless of how admirable a life he leads. I am not saying dishonable discharges are handed out unjustly or indiscriminately. But many times offenders are young and immature men, who are sorry soon after. Other youths in civilian life or at college are forgiven deeds which are less rapidly forgiven in a soldier. No, injustice is not the point, though we all know unjust decisions occur in military courts as well as in civilian.

My point is that a rehabilitated person deserves an opportunity to clear his record of old stains. A man who has owned up to his past mistakes and overcome his weaknesses, deserves a chance to erase this last enduring obstacle to advancement. An exemplary rehabilitation certificate holds out this hope.

Our bill would have the Secretary of Labor appoint review boards which would pass judgment on applications for these certificates. They would not be given out lightly. Three years would have to elapse before any application would be in order. Evidence of rehabilitation would have to be strong. Acceptable evidence would include notarized statements from the chief law enforcement officer or the applicant's community, from his employer, and from people who have known him well. The reviewing board would use these statements and its own independent investigations to determine an applicant's reliability, good character, and general reputation.

If the decision of the board is favorable, an applicant's military personnel record would thereafter include a copy of his certificate. He would not become eligible for Federal benefits which would be his under an honorable discharge. However, he would be given job counseling and help in finding a job. He would be a prouder man through the effort he had made to reform himself.

The days are rapidly disappearing when men can be branded for one mistake, and victims of circumstance shoved aside without compassion. Congress has an important task to help people help themselves in achieving a full measure of dignity. I urge Congress to endorse these certificates for they reflect concern for this task.

The bill reads as follows:

H.R. 15310

A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of Exemplary Rehibilitation Certificates to certain individuals after considering their character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal from the Armed Forces; and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part II of subtitle A of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after chapter 79 thereof the following new chapter:

"Chapter 80. Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates

"Sec.
"1571. Establishment of boards.
"1572. Consideration and issuance of certificate.
"1573. Matters considered.
"1574. Other benefits.
"1575. Job counseling and employment placement.
"1576. Reports.

"§ 1571. Establishment of boards.

"The Secretary of Labor shall establish boards to receive and act on any application for an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate received under this chapter from any person who was discharged or dismissed under conditions other than honorable at least three years before the date of receipt of such application.

"§ 1572. Consideration and issuance of certificate.

"In the case of any person discharged or dismissed from an armed force under conditions other than honorable before or after the enactment of this chapter, a board may, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, consider an application for, and issue to that person, an 'Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate' dated as of the date of issuance, if it is established to the satisfaction of the board that such person has rehabilitated himself, that his character is good, and that his conduct, activities, and habits since he was so discharged or dismissed have been exemplary for a reasonable period of time, but not less than three years. The Secretary of Labor shall supply a copy of each such Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate which is issued, to the Secretary of Defense, who shall place such copy in the military personnel record of the individual to whom the certificate is issued.

§ 1573. Matters considered.

"(a) For the purposes of section 1572, oral and written evidence, or both, may be used, including—

"(1) a notarized statement from the chief law enforcement officer of the town, city, or county in which the applicant resides, attesting to his general reputation so far as police and court records are concerned;

"(2) a notarized statement from his employer, if employed, attesting to his general reputation and employment record;

"(3) notarized statements from not less than five persons, attesting that they have personally known him for at least three years as a person of good reputation and exemplary conduct, and the extent of personal contact they have had with him; and

"(4) such independent investigation as the board may make.

"(b) Any person making application under this chapter may appear before a board considering such application in person or by counsel.

"§ 1574. Other benefits.

"No benefits under any laws of the United States (including, but not limited to, those relating to pensions, compensation, hospitalization, military pay and allowances, education, loan guarantees, retired pay, or other benefits based on military service) shall accrue to any person to whom an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate is issued under section 1572 unless he would be entitled to those benefits under his original discharge or dismissal.

"§ 1575. Job counseling and employment placement.

"The Secretary of Labor shall accord to any individual who has been discharged or dismissed under conditions other than honorable, but who has been issued an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate under this chapter, the same privileges and benefits accorded to veterans under chapter 41 of title 38.

"§ 1576. Reports.

"The Secretary of Labor shall report to Congress not later than January 15 of each year the number of cases reviewed by each board under this chapter, and the number of Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates issued."

SEC. 2. The analysis of part II of subtitle A of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately below

"79. Correction of Military Records--- 1551"

the following:

"80. Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates ------------------------ 1571".

SEC. 3. (a) Section 2001 of title 38, United States Code, clauses (3) and (5) of section 2002 of such title, and sections 2003 and 2004 of such title are amended by striking out "veterans of any war or of service after January 31, 1955" each place it appears therein.

(b) The first sentence of section 2002 of such title 38 is amended by striking out "veteran of any war or of service after January 31, 1955".

(c) Clauses (1) and (4) of section 2003 of such title 38 are amended by striking out "veterans of any war or of service after January 31, 1955," each place it appears in such clauses.

Vietnam Polls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, these are the results of the poll I conducted in the Seventh Congressional District of Michigan which represents a return of approximately 10,000 opinions. In April I sent approximately 111,000 questionnaires to residents in my district.

I feel the most significant conclusions to be drawn from the majority of replies is that our Nation has a vital interest in southeast Asia and that our Vietnam intervention was justified, specifically to resist Communist aggression with force if necessary.

It is evident that these results would not depict the true story since my questionnaire was mailed a few days prior to the political disturbances in Vietnam.

I am confident that the positions taken by my constituents will be of particular interest to my colleagues.

The results of my poll are:

Continue our present Vietnam policy?	913
Intensify our military efforts in Vietnam?	4,200
Total favoring military commitment	5,113
Pull our troops out of Vietnam?	4,034
Undecided	529

Two-Hundred-Billion-Electron-Volt Proton Accelerator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I have attempted to keep the Congress fully informed as to the information received by the committee on the proposed large accelerator—the 200-billion-electron-volt proton accelerator.

The last time I spoke on this subject was on May 9, 1966, in connection with the House consideration of the AEC's authorizing legislation for fiscal year 1967. As I pointed out on that occasion, the AEC had not requested nor had the committee authorized funds for engineering design or construction of the 200-Bev. accelerator. The AEC was then as it is now considering six sites for the proposed large accelerator. These sites are located in the vicinity of Ann Arbor, Mich.; Brookhaven National Laboratory in Long Island, N.Y.; Denver, Colo.; Madison, Wis.; Sierra Foothills, Calif.; and Weston, Ill. A selection from among these six is expected during the remaining months of 1966. If the Commission holds to the schedule indicated to us at the time of our authorization hearings, which we set forth in the committee's report—House Report No. 1471, May 3, 1966, page 28—a selection should be expected by the end of September.

Today I wish to acquaint the Members of this House with a new estimate for the construction costs of the 200 Bev accelerator. You will recall that the President's fiscal year 1967 budget report had an estimate of $375 million. This included $40,500,000 for research equipment and $27 million for a major detection device. The basic engineering and construction for the large accelerator was $307.5 million in that estimate. An independent cost estimate subsequently made for the Commission by a combine of architect-engineers, known as DUSAF, now places the estimated costs of basic engineering and construction of this accelerator at $327,336,000. If the research equipment and large detection device are added to the new estimate to make it comparable to the President's budget estimate—it would show that the estimated cost for the 200 Bev accelerator is now $395,000,000.

The new AEC report on the 200 Bev accelerator also indicates that it would take 8 years from the go ahead on the project until the accelerator is ready for experimentation.

I will continue to keep the House informed of any new information relative to this accelerator that the Joint Committee receives.

Expenses of Hawaii's First Medicare Patient Paid Without Any Hitch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I should like to share with my colleagues the happy experience of Hawaii's first medicare patient, Mr. Elias Dabalos, who was able to obtain assistance payment for his 5-day hospitalization in Honolulu under the new Federal program without any difficulty, delay, or inconvenience whatsoever.

It is a timely and encouraging story, for it serves to dispel the doubts expressed by the vociferous few about the administrative workability of medicare.

The 68-year-old taxi driver saved $218.10 as a medicare participant. A representative of the Hawaii Medical Service Association which handles all Hawaii claims under the hospital provisions of medicare said that Dabalos's case shows up the "efficiency of the new programs and dispels fears that medicare would be an administrative nightmare."

The newspaper article revealing Mr. Dabalos' happy experience appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of July 23, 1966. I now submit the article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ISLES' FIRST MEDICARE PATIENT SAVED $218

Elias Dabalos, Hawaii's first Medicare hospital patient, saved $218.10 under the Federal program.

Dabalos, a 68-year-old Honolulu taxidriver, was admitted to Queen's Hospital at the very moment that Medicare went into effect at 12:01 a.m. July 1.

He was suffering from intense breathing difficulty resulting from a hole between his lung and chest wall that caused an excessive build-up of air to be trapped next to his lung. The undue pressure was causing his lung to collapse.

The bill for his five-day hospital confinement, plus treatment and services, totaled $261.55.

Dabalos paid the first $40. That payment is called for in any spell of illness.

He also paid $3.54 for take-home drugs that are not covered.

His total share of the cost was $43.45.

The Hawaii Medical Service Association (H.M.S.A.), which handles all Hawaii claims under the hospital portion of Medicare, said Dabalos's case shows up the "efficiency of the new programs and dispels fears that Medicare would be an administrative nightmare."

Compromise Urged on Grand Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, voices from arid parts of the West are joining those of citizens in other regions in opposition to proposals to build dams in the Grand Canyon.

An editorial in the Salt Lake Tribune of July 3, 1966, contains an excellent analysis of this issue, stressing the damage the dams would cause:

[From the Salt Lake (Utah) Tribune, July 3, 1966]

COMPROMISE URGED ON GRAND CANYON

A bill authorizing the $1,700,000,000 Colorado River Basin (Central Arizona) project seems destined to be approved by the House Interior Committee, but vigorous opponents in the House have warned, "we have not yet begun to fight."

The Western-dominated irrigation and reclamation subcommittee advanced the controversial bill last week by a 13–5 vote, opposition coming mainly from the Pacific Northwestern states. The measure is, as Utah Sen. Moss said, "a very complex and involved bill," and it is encouraging that Sen. Bennett has called for reading the measure carefully when it gets to the upper House.

The tenuous alliance of the lower and upper Colorado River basins may bring about final approval of the big Rube Goldberg type project but with every conservation organization of distinction lined up zealously against it, there is serious danger that the Reclamation Bureau itself will emerge with deep and lasting wounds, jeopardizing future projects irrespective of their merits.

WOULD FLOOD MONUMENT, PARK

Troublesome questions loom about details of the agreement between the upper and lower basins and about the funds, current and future, for the Central Utah and other reclamation projects. We are mainly concerned here with the proposal to build two power dams in Grand Canyon and its emotional impact on programs for best use of limited water in the West.

One damsite is in Marble Gorge of the Colorado River in Arizona, upstream from Grand Canyon National Park and downstream from Glen Canyon Dam. This would have an installed capacity of 600,000 kilowatts. The other dam, 673 feet high, would be downstream at Bridge Canyon and would have an installed capacity of 1.5 million kilowatts.

When the administration sent the program to Congress a little more than a year ago the Budget Bureau deferred the Bridge Canyon Dam, which would cost about 511 million dollars and would create a reservoir backing all the way through Grand Canyon National Monument and 13 miles into Grand Canyon National Park (though not visible from the canyon rim in the park). The implication was that Marble Canyon alone could provide the needed pumping power and revenue for the Central Arizona project.

Reclamation Commissioner Dominy sees both dams as needed "cash registers" for the project, however, and as the bill stands both dams are included.

FOSSIL FUEL STUDY URGED

Damming the Colorado at Marble Gorge would change the river's flow and alter its effect on the geology of the Grand Canyon floor, but it would not otherwise invade the national park as would Bridge Canyon dam (recently renamed Hualapai for Indians in the area who have been enlisted in the drive for the project). A suppressed report by the National Park Service said this dam would leave great scenic areas "clogged with silt and debris that a diminished river could never wash away." Neither Park Service or U.S. Geological Survey experts were heard at the subcommittee hearings, not even to evaluate conservationist group claims regarding silt or the startling claim that the Central Arizona project could be built and operated at a profit if both Bridge and Marble dams were deleted.

More information is needed as to the potentialities of using fossil fuels such as coal and oil, and nuclear energy to supply the needed power. Thermal power generation facilities are already planned for the area, including the touted Kaiparowits plant in southern Utah which would supply several times the capacity of the two proposed hyroelectric plants. Kaiparowits also would utilize raw material from one of the world's largest untapped coal beds.

NEITHER FOR STORAGE

Under present plans neither Marble nor Bridge Canyon dams would be for diversion or storage. Existing reservoirs would take care of that.

Arizona wants—has to have—water. California needs and wants power. We believe Congress has a solemn obligation to seek a solution that does not involve spoiling the lower reaches of Grand Canyon. We urge particularly that the Bridge Canyon project be omitted.

Address of Congressman Ed Reinecke Upon Receipt of an Award by the Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending the dinner at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., on Wednesday, July 20, held by the Captive Nations in observance of Captive Nations Week.

During the course of the proceedings, our colleague, the Honorable ED REINECKE, of the 27th District of California, received an award for his service in the cause of freedom. His address on that occasion is one that I commend to my colleagues:

REMARKS OF HON. ED REINECKE, REPUBLICAN, OF CALIFORNIA, AT THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK DINNER, THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 20, 1966

Thank you very much for this opportunity to join with you tonight for the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week at this dinner honoring members of the United States Congress. Perhaps, however, the honor and tribute of this particular occasion should be reversed. We Congressmen owe you a debt of gratitude for your sincere concern in the affairs of this nation, and the world, and for your willingness to give of your time and resources to serve the cause of freedom. Your dedication sets a valuable and excellent example.

As we gather here in this notable place we cannot help but wonder what effect these annual observances have on the communist governments of Eastern Europe. Apparently we bother them a little. And I'm glad about that, aren't you?

After last year's Captive Nations observances a few reports of reaction filtered through the iron curtain. One editor of a newspaper in the Ukraine said, "They are beating the drums again across the sea, filling the columns in newspapers and delivering hypocritcal speeches. For the umteenth time the ruling circles of the United States are holding the so-called 'Captive Nations Week.' And the propaganda machine is deafening the citizens with atrocious inventions about the fate of nations which are suffering under the yoke of the Kremlin regime."

Another Russian writer said, "Especially disgusting is the villainous demagoguery of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize a so-called captive nations week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke . . ."

It seems that these observances have been effective in developing a psychological and political weapon against the tyranny of Eastern Europe. These reactions sound like another way of saying "we'd better be careful."

We must also ask ourselves the question: "Why should we be concerned, as Americans, for the plight of people in such far away places? We have many problems of our own to solve. We are engaged in a major military action in Southeast Asia. And besides, what can we do about the people of Eastern Europe, short of a major war with the Communist world?"

I think that the answers to these questions come from the deepest roots of our own country's history. For the work that was begun just one hundred and ninety years ago is still going on today. It is spreading around the world.

I am reminded of the words of Emerson in his "Concord Hymn" when he said:

"By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embattled farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard 'round the world."

The sound of that shot still rings throughout the world. For in the goals of our revolution we crystalized the deep aspirations of every man in every nation and in every age. Our revolution is still going on. And so is theirs. And that is why we cannot turn our backs on them. They are following in our battle paths. And we dare not let them down. Our revolution, and their struggles to throw off the yoke of tyranny are part of the same universal battle of mankind for freedom, for spiritual fulfillment, for peace, for prosperity and for progress.

And if we be true to our own principles of democracy and of individual responsibility and individual liberty, and to our own system of free enterprise, we must believe that every people should have the opportunity to choose for themselves a system of government. They must be allowed to adapt to their own cultures the universal concepts of free self-government.

We have often said in this country that if even one man lives in fear or in tyranny or does not enjoy the full opportunities afforded by our Constitution then we all live in fear and tyranny. In our free society if one man is robbed of his unalienable rights or of his dignity, then all men become victims of the same crime.

And this principle ought to be applied to the world as a whole. For if the freedom of one nation is destroyed then the freedom of all nations is in jeopardy. And if any people anywhere suffer from the burdens of captivity, then all people everywhere are in some measure held equally captive.

Therefore, we see that the plight of the captive peoples of Eastern Europe, and even of southeast Asia, becomes the plight of free men everywhere. Their struggle becomes our struggle. Our stewardship of democracy becomes their hope for freedom. That is why we cannot neglect the over 100 million people held captive by Communist colonialism. That is why we are here this evening.

Well, then, what are we going to do about it? What hope do we hold out to these people? What is our responsibility?

The United States, whether we like it or not, has been thrust into history at this time as the leader of the free world. The cause of freedom and the development of its ideals has become the great work of our generation. How have we done so far?

We have not done all that we could. In current times we have seen the steady decline of the great alliance of NATO. Time and time again the initiative to take positive action in foreign affairs has been stolen from us by our enemies. Our foreign policy has become simply a series of stop-gap emergency reactions.

Because of the inaction and lack of forethought of those who carry the responsibility our diplomats have been made to appear like a water brigade running back and forth around the world putting out brush fires.

It is time that the United States reassert its leadership in the free world rather than to follow the whims of those who do not care, or who are playing power politics with the fate of their nations.

Leadership means ideas. New ideas; and we had better start thinking. I propose that we mount an effective "freedom offensive." A campaign using psychological, political and economic weapons against the regimes of captive nations everywhere. We have already seen what this simple observance here will do to unnerve and irritate those on the other side of the iron curtain. And we ought to do more of it.

In our freedom offensive we ought to draw more broadly on the resources of leadership of the responsible private sector of this country.

I propose that we gather together, under private sponsorship, or under the authority of the Congress or the President, the great technicians of mass communication, advertising, and public relations for a brief time to design a creative program of propaganda to be used against the regimes of iron and bamboo curtain countries. The technology of propaganda, and I use that word in the best sense, has been developed by private industry to an amazing degree. But not enough of this new knowledge has been put to work by our government's foreign public relations directors.

We need fewer foreign policy philosophers, and more communications experts in the United States Information Agency. The Voice of America should be strengthened and its programming drastically improved.

We need to draw more upon the experience and resourcefulness of our motion picture industry, our radio and television industry, and our universities with their vast new communications research centers. We ought to bring to government the fresh ideas that these people have. Then we could mount a psychological campaign that would beam the weapons of ideology and the hope of freedom to the captive peoples of the world. It has never really been done before. Why not try it?

We are all well aware of the work of the Peace Corps. I would like to propose a "freedom corps." The hope of future freedom in the captive nations lies in the youth of those countries. Through the contacts of the

Assembly of Captive European Nations, and through the opportunities offered by many other groups, the young people of the United States could begin to correspond with the youth behind the iron curtain. In this way they could share the ideas of freedom and keep alive the hopes and aspirations of youth. Perhaps even personal meetings could be arranged; and travel by American youth in the Eastern European countries could provide the opportunity to encourage the hope of freedom in the hearts of young people. In this way we would be building a sound foundation for the future liberation of captive peoples.

In the matter of the economic and political offensives, we must seek to drive a wedge into every tiny crack that appears in the iron curtain. We must avoid every pitfall that might lend comfort or support to the Communist regimes of these countries. We must not provide the means for propping up their failing economies and thereby perpetuate their dictatorial governments. If we must trade, then let's be sure that we receive a reciprocal political advantage for our trade.

I would propose that we bring before the United Nations General Assembly the whole question of the captive nations, and request that the Soviet Union be made to answer to the charges of history.

Or, as an alternative, that we embark on a diplomatic freedom offensive, similar to the recent peace offensive for Vietnam, to seek the cooperation and ideas of every free nation in a united effort to liberate the captive peoples.

Real progress demands revision of thought, policy, and action. We need to do a lot more thinking about extending the frontiers of freedom. We have grown too accustomed to living in a world half-free and half-slave.

There can be no peace in the world; no peace among nations; no peace in the hearts of captive peoples until all the world—every nation—and each person is free. "Freedom isn't free," in the words of the popular song.

"Freedom isn't free.
You've got to pay the price,
You've got to sacrifice,
For your liberty."

The easiest thing for a rich nation to do is to give of its wealth. But the noblest thing for any nation to do is to give of its heart.

Let the price we pay for our freedom be to lift even higher the torch of liberty—and by its light to expose the still darkened corners of captive nations—in Asia, as well as in Eastern Europe. Let the price we pay be to extend our heart and hand in encouragement and moral support to those whose struggle for freedom is not yet accomplished. And let our word of courage be to them that "there is a universal, eternal law which is man's will to be free. And though the struggle may be long and hard, you have allies in every nation on earth, and in every age of history." The thrilling inspiration of freedom will one day thrive again in the hearts of the peoples of eastern Europe.

A Failure of the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on July 20 I voiced my disappointment over the decision of the World Court on Southwest Africa, and urged the United States to take the lead in proposing new initiatives for self-determination through the United Nations. My remarks were carried in the RECORD at that time.

The Long Island Star-Journal of that same date carried an editorial entitled "A Failure of the U.N.," which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues. This article certainly echoes my sentiments.

We must continue to strengthen the United Nations, and to make it a more effective instrument in the cause of world peace.

The editorial follows:

A Failure of the U.N.

The cause of world law has been severely set back by the one instrument of that law—the International Court of Justice.

The world court, an agency of the United Nations inherited from the League of Nations, dismissed on a technicality a complaint by Ethiopia and Liberia against the invasion of apartheid in the territory of South-West Africa, mandated to the Union of South Africa by the League in 1920.

After six years of litigation, costing millions of dollars, a 7–7 deadlock of the court was broken Monday by court President Sir Percy Spender of Australia. The majority ruled that Ethiopia and Liberia, as individual members of the League of Nations, had no legal right to bring the suits. Such action, it was held, could only be brought by the League Council, which no longer exists. In other words, the world court ducked the issue.

And thus, in the words of the Times of London, a "matter of great substance has been set aside on a legal technicality." The failure of the court to deal with the question of apartheid is more than a failure of the court. It points up the absence of effective law throughout the international community. It reflects the weakness of the United Nations itself.

Law, if it is to be relevant to reality, must also be backed by force sufficient to insure compliance. Anything else is an exercise in futility—or in this case—is unnecessary mischief. The mischief in this case was that in ducking, the court gave aid and comfort to South Africa and raised a political storm of protest throughout the world.

The court's mistake was probably in agreeing to hear the question in the first place. This compounded that mistake by failing to make a substantive ruling.

The world court should stick to minor cases of limited applicability until the world is ready to grant it the status it must have to rule effectively on such great issues as apartheid. The world court is no better or worse than the United Nations, just as the United Nations is no better or no worse than the world it reflects. The world court will be an effective instrument of world law only when the U.N. itself reflects a world ready, willing and able to give it the power to enforce that law.

Give Drugs to Addicts So We Can Be Safe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post there appeared an article by former New York City Judge Jonah J. Goldstein recommending that drug addicts be given the narcotics they require through legal means, that such treatment would make our cities safer. Judge Goldstein served as a judge in New York City courts for 25 years. Now 80, he is, and has been for more than 30 years, president of the Grand Street Boys Association, a philanthropic organization formed on New York's Lower East Side, in my congressional district, in 1921. Judge Goldstein's statement appeared in the Speaking Out series of the magazine:

Give Drugs to Addicts So We Can Be Safe

(By Jonah J. Goldstein)

Not long ago an office building in New York's Rockefeller Center area hired private detectives to catch the thieves who were stealing everything movable and salable from the offices in the buildings, night after night. The detectives caught 49 men; 43 of them were narcotics addicts.

Half the crimes in New York City today—the robberies, the muggings, the burglaries—are committed by drug addicts, and other cities are beginning to share New York's dangers. A while back, one of our newspapers carried a banner headline: "New Crime Wave Expected." Because federal narcotics agents had seized a big heroin shipment in the port, the story explained, heroin prices would go up, and addicts would have to rob more people to buy their shots.

What kind of police protection is it—what kind of *law* is it—that turns a great triumph of law enforcement into the cause of a crime wave?

Discussions of drug addiction always seem to turn on the question of what happens to the addict. Instead of worrying so much about the one tenth of one percent of the population who are hooked on drugs, let's worry about the 99.9 percent who aren't, and whose homes and lives are less secure because we drive sick people to crime with our narcotics laws.

Mind you, the drug addict is almost never dangerous when he's under the influence of drugs—narcotics are sedatives. What makes him dangerous is the desperate need for the money to buy the next dose. And the costs are stupendous. The $50-a-day addict must steal $250 to $300 merchandise daily to support his habit; and when you catch him it costs $15 a day of tax revenues to keep him alive in jail.

I don't want the kind of system where people have to register to get their narcotics. Some addicts are wanted by the police: they wouldn't register. All we need is a simple arrangement by which the addict who can pay for the shot can go to his doctor and get it—and the poor addict can go to the clinic, just as the poor diabetic goes to the clinic for a shot of insulin.

"You don't have to worry about giving him too much and killing him," says Dr. Herbert Berger, formerly head of the committee on addiction of the Medical Society of the State of New York. "His problem is that his tolerance for the stuff increases. You have to give him enough to keep him comfortable, the way you give the diabetic enough insulin to maintain his blood-sugar level."

Nobody would have to sign up for "treatment" unless he wanted it; nobody would even have to give a name or sign a receipt—just walk in the front door, get the shot and walk out the back door. Any nurse could do the job. The single dose, of course, would have to be moderately light. If a man's condition is such that he needs another dose, he can come around to the front door again.

A simple test could guarantee that nobody gets narcotics at the clinic unless he is already addicted. Another test, perhaps an invisible-ink time stamp that comes out under an ultraviolet lamp, could give enough control on the number of doses to make sure nobody used the clinic's narcotics to the point of killing himself.

Under today's rules, we can't even prevent the use of narcotics for murder. I once proposed my version of the perfect crime to the inspector in charge of New York's narcotics bureau. The mob suspects that one of the boys, an addict, is a stool for the police. So the next time he makes his connection, his little packet contains much more than his usual dose. He puts it in his arm, and goes out like a light. In New York you would hear about it, because our Chief Medical Examiner finds everything and tells everything he finds—but there are lots of places in this country where that kind of murder would go into the books as heart failure. I wondered how many police informers died of such "heart failure." My inspector friend heard me out, then said sourly, "Do you know any more jokes?"

One night at dinner at the Grand Street Boys Association I was talking about narcotics with a monsignor of the Catholic Church. He asked me if I'd give a man five dollars if he asked me for five dollars to buy a shot of heroin. I said, "Of course I would."

"Wouldn't you be concerned that you might be shortening his life?" the monsignor said.

"That's his business," I said.

I smoke cigars. Now that I'm eighty I've cut down, by smoking only one at a time. I know it's bad for me. And if you don't smoke, are you going to live forever? What are they going to do about smoking—make it a crime?

I think there'd be a good case for giving the addict his drugs even if it did help him harm himself. There are a thousand times as many people who are not addicts as there are addicts, and the important thing is to help them. And I can't see how an addict can harm himself more by going to a clinic than he does now by roaming the streets and robbing people to get the money to buy adulterated stuff from a vicious pusher. Is the female addict any better off as a prostitute? Anyway, why do you think the addict is so sure to be harmed?

When I was on the bench and the cops brought in a workingman who was an addict, I'd call him and his wife into my chambers and I'd show them a map of Texas. I'd say "Pick a town near the Mexican border, and go down there and get yourself a job. When you need the drugs, just walk across the border—you can buy the stuff there for the price of a pack of cigarettes. So you don't work eight hours a day, you only work six—you're still a lot better off than you will be up here, going in and out of jails and hospitals."

The son of one of my best friends got hooked while he was at college. He and his father fought it for years—all the treatments they could buy, federal hospital in Lexington, Ky., and all the rest. Finally they came to me for advice. I said, "Pick a country where you can get the drugs, and go live there." I saw that young man not long ago in his new country: he's married, he's got children, he's living a useful life. Here he'd be in hiding all the time.

In my 25 years as a judge, I never had a rich user brought before me. I said that while I was still on the bench, and the newspaper picked it up. The next day I got a call from the Government's chief New York narcotics agent, who said he wanted to see me. He came up to my chambers and said, "It's not true we don't go after the rich addicts. We've been following one for five years, and one of these days we're going to get him."

I asked for the name, and he mentioned one of the most famous and best-loved men in America, a man who's given away fortunes to charity, especially charity to help kids. I asked the federal chief what good he thought it would do to take a man like that and throw him in jail and ruin him, just because he used drugs. And then—as a citizen, not as a judge—I called the man and warned him. He said sadly, "I know about it."

Some say that giving shots to addicts will increase addiction. I doubt it. I don't think the end of prohibition increased the consumption of alcohol, or the number of alcoholics.

At football games in the 1920's you saw lots of people carrying flasks; you don't see as much of that today. Before I was a judge I was Al Smith's assistant. He used to carry a cane with a tube inside, all through prohibition. At banquets when he was governor, Franklin Roosevelt would have a coffee cup with bourbon in it. I remember once he told the leader of the State Assembly to pick up some Pikesville whiskey for him on a trip to New York. That was his favorite—Pikesville whiskey. That whiskey had a New York City motorcycle escort to the city line, then state troopers all the way to Albany, to make sure the prohibition agents wouldn't interfere. Later the man who delivered it to the governor told me Roosevelt immediately opened one of the jugs and slung it over his arm, country style, to take a drink. My friend said, "That man'll never amount to anything!"

During prohibition important people never had any trouble getting whiskey. And there are some important people who have no trouble getting drugs today. Harry Anslinger, who was federal Commissioner of Narcotics, once testified to supplying a congressman with drugs out of the Government's own stock, because it would be dangerous to let somebody outside get that kind of hold on a congressman. Everybody knows about doctors and anesthetists who have the habit. Narcotics agents don't want to let the doctors handle the problem because the police know that many doctors are addicts themselves. Men work as orderlies in hospitals for less money than they could make washing dishes in a cafeteria, because the job brings them near the source of their drugs. But why touch them—if they can live with their habit and do their work?

For years I have been receiving letters from people who are addicts, but nobody knows it except themselves and their doctors. They were in an accident or a fire once, or badly wounded in the war (I once had a man before me who got the habit as a prisoner of war in North Korea). The doses that then kept them from agony later became the curse of their lives. Some of them became substantial businessmen and professional men, but they had to live with the knowledge that they and their doctors were breaking the law every day.

Though many of the addicts we now make criminals could live useful lives with their habit, many others are hopeless derelicts. Nobody who has served as a judge in a criminal court could ever deny that addiction is a terrible thing If we had a cure for addiction, there might even be an argument for the sort of program Governor Rockefeller has been advocating—ordering users to hospitals for treatment as soon as their addiction is discovered. But the hospitals don't help. We've had federal narcotics hospitals for more than 30 years in Lexington and Fort Worth, and the biggest claim I've ever seen for cures is 10 percent. Most doctors I know think 2 percent is optimistic.

In planning what to do right now, we have to start with the fact that addicts as a rule *can't* shake the habit, and that nothing we know how to do is much help to most of them. The psychiatrists have quit on the problem. One of them, Dr. Joost A. M. Meerloo, recently put their belief in his own kind of language: "Drug addiction is much more related to the pusher and the existence of criminal seduction and hyprocritical laws than to circumscribed pathology within the individual." Do you eliminate the pushers and criminal seduction and hypocritical laws by ordering people into hospitals?

All the police and the courts can do with today's law is increase the risk to the pusher. The greater the risk to the pusher, the higher the profits from pushing, and the stronger the temptation to push The mob opposes reform of the narcotics laws now, just as the bootleggers always backed the drys in the fight on prohibition.

Make the drugs easily available to the addicts, and you take the profits out of pushing. Then if you find anybody pushing drugs, especially to kids, you can slap him in jail and throw away the key—let him rot. The law can do its job. Without the profits, there won't be new pushers to come up and replace the jailbirds.

Giving away the drugs doesn't solve the problem—we'll still need a cure for addiction as much as we ever did. Today's stupid laws make it nearly impossible to launch a research project big enough to get near the problem. Dr. Berger estimates that in New York, the worst-afflicted city, there are now only five or six doctors interested in the addiction problem. Take the stigma off the subject and provide money, and maybe we can have doctors instead of pushers and police determining what happens to sick people in our country.

But let's keep our eyes on what our criminal laws are supposed to do. We don't write them to protect or to rehabilitate the addict or the criminal, to mete out exact Solomon-like justice to the pusher. We write them to protect the society, all the ordinary people who obey the law without ever knowing that's what they're doing. Our laws on narcotics should benefit the 190-odd million who don't take drugs, not the 200,000 who do. I think it would turn out that we'd help them, too, but that's not what's important. The significant victim of the present law is not the derelict half-crazed addict with the need for drugs who mugs the old lady on the street, but the old lady herself.

Let's forget some of the fancy theories and make our cities safer by giving the addict the narcotics he needs.

JUDGE GOLDSTEIN.

New Winds in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal quotes Secretary Rusk's remark that "new winds are blowing in Asia" in an editorial backing the substance of the Johnson administration's policy in Asia.

No single factor can be credited for the heartening developments, the newspaper says. Even so, it acknowledges, the most hopeful turn has become apparent since the United States made clear that we mean business in southeast Asia.

The Journal has in the past expressed reservations about certain aspects of our policy, but reaffirms its belief that firmness against communist encroachment has been necessary.

And it says the new winds blowing in Asia suggest that U.S. policy has more substance to it than the vociferous detractors will ever admit.

I now offer the editorial for the Record:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 15, 1966]

New Winds in Asia

"Truly one can sense that new winds are blowing in Asia," Secretary of State Rusk remarked upon completing his Far Eastern tour. He joins a growing number of observers who find the Asian outlook, if not optimistic, at least noticeably brighter than a year or so ago.

Secretary Rusk reports "fresh hope and fresh energy" in the field of economic and social development and a "growing sense of community" among non-Communist Asian nations. Certainly there are hopeful signs in the recent conference of a number of those nations in Korea and new agreements for an Asian development bank. In addition, the huge nation of Indonesia has sharply reversed its drift toward both communism and misrule, and a number of smaller nations display somewhat less of a tendency to cozy up to Communist China.

It would obviously be foolish to describe the firm U.S. stand in Vietnam as the sole, or even the most fundamental, reason for the encouraging changes. Other explanations abound: The non-Communist nations' natural self-interest in cooperation, Sukarno's blundering rule in Indonesia, Red China's own guacheries in internal development and foreign relations. It would be equally foolish to deny that the whole outlook could be quickly reversed by developments in Vietnam or elsewhere.

Even so, and contrary to the constant criticism of American policy, the more hopeful turn has become appearent mostly since the U.S. made clear it means business in Southeast Asia. It may well be that this demonstration was the trigger which allowed underlying factors to operate.

If it is clear China will not be allowed easy conquests by subversion, leaders of small non-Communist lands understandably will find more reason for serious attention to economic development and other pressing problems.

Similarly, a feeling that China after all will not ultimately dominate the entire Orient would figure in the Indonesian military's decision to move openly against the Communists, and also in the nuances of attitude of smaller neutralist nations. Future expectations, whatever their basis, nearly always weigh heavily in human affairs.

Australian Prime Minister Harold E. Holt, for one, finds a direct link between American policy in Vietnam and the apparent resurgence of non-Communist Asia. On his visit here, he commented, "It should be of some encouragement to Americans to know that the defense effort in South Vietnam is not just limited to spending money and losing lives, but has already resulted in the strengthening of all Southeast Asia."

Precisely this kind of result—influencing the future of Asia by demonstrating to friend and foe alike that even subversive aggression will not pay—has been the basic object of U.S. policy in Vietnam. And while these columns have often expressed reservations about the haphazard "choice" of Vietnam as the place and the outlook for an acceptable sentiment, we have never doubted that a demonstration of firmness against Communist encroachment was necessary.

Communism, like other forms of totalitarianism, will expand by force if it has the opportunity. The alternative to confronting it with force, including military force if it comes to that, is to allow its expansion, whetting its appetities and undermining the confidence of its next victims.

The new winds in Asia may prove ephemeral but they are palpable now. They suggest that American policy, whatever its tactical and other errors, has more substance to it than the vociferous detractors will ever admit.

Dempsey Greets Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article that was published July 14, 1966, in the Hartford Times under the byline of Malcolm Carter, Times staff writer, which illustrates the vigorous, humanitarian, and friendly type Connecticut Gov. John N. Dempsey is.

The article, describing Governor Dempsey's visit to Camp Drum, Watertown, N.Y., to greet personally the 3,291 Connecticut National Guardsmen training there, follows:

Dempsey Greets Guard: Finds Morale High

(By Malcolm Carter)

Camp Drum, Watertown, N.Y.—Dust, heat and winds.

Also military precision, inspections and GI chow.

Then politicking, handshaking and encouragement.

Very little rest in an 11-hour day.

Such was Governor Dempsey's visit here Wednesday after leaving Hartford by airplane at 8 a.m. and returning 11 hours later.

Official brass was at its polished best in the convoy which escorted the commander-in-chief of the Connecticut National Guard ending two weeks' training here Friday.

Traveling nearly 40 miles of dusty, rut-scarred roads on the 100,000 acre campsite, the Governor donned a paisley sport shirt, casual slacks and army fatigue cap to visit personally with the 3,291 state men in training here.

Informality marked the day, with the Governor shaking every hand he saw and thanking the men for doing their part.

After jouncing 15 miles to an artillery target site, Dempsey climbed into a protective bunker labeled "Pork Chop Hill" and watched through binoculars as 155 mm howitzers boomed and shells whistled and exploded in fiery bursts hundreds of yards down range.

After the artillery performance, the Governor's convoy had lunch under the trees—on white linen tablecloths, with GI waiters serving chow.

The fare was roast turkey, dressing, whipped potatoes, salad, lemonade and frosted cake. No one complained.

In fact, an officer sitting at an adjacent table said: "I wish the Governor would come every day."

Another man observed, "Gee, no lumps in these potatoes." But the remarks seemed all in fun. Men privately agreed the food is uniformly good.

The Governor asked a group of men waiting to enter a gas chamber used to make them appreciate gas masks, "How's the food here?"

The men chorused, "Great." There's one in every crowd, and he quipped, "If you have an iron stomach."

Arriving at a lecture on offensive tactics, the Governor picked up a microphone and told the men:

"Fellows, you were sitting down when I came in. Will you please sit down now."

He noted he was "delighted at the morale and spirit" he found at the camp.

Then the Governor himself sat down, peered at battle maps and listened to part of the lecture. During an intermission, Dempsey mixed with the Guardsmen, shaking hands and saying, "It's good to see you."

He queried Guardsmen about the camp and asked how they liked the instructors. The men approved, and the Governor observed, "It's one thing to know it and another to teach it."

Back at the microphone, the instructor decided a 15-minute break was long enough.

"With the Governor's permission," he said, "we'd like to have you get back in your seats and get started."

Throughout the day, Dempsey often requested pencil and paper to scribble the name of the relative or friend of a Guardsman he had met. He would remember the relative and promise to write.

As he talked to the men, the Governor spiced thanks for what the men were doing and appreciation for the rigors they were undergoing with jokes about the weather.

"It's been awfully warm at home," he would say. "Of course, it hasn't been hot up here."

Before climaxing the day with a reception in the officers' mess hall, Dempsey watched a class in hand-to-hand combat. A captain explained an attack, and two experts demonstrated.

Did everybody see that? the captain asked.

"Yes, sir, I did," the men shouted in unison. Again and again they were reminded they were "tigers." Shaking the expert's hand, the Governor drew a laugh when he wondered aloud whether he had inflicted serious injury.

It was a day of morale boosting and of seeing not quite the real dirt and disappointment. But it was a view very few chief executives see.

Dempsey said he was impressed with the behavior of the men and with their lack of complaints for the camp itself.

As he boarded the homeward-bound airplane, Dempsey glanced downfield at a formal review for the incoming Vermont governor, Philip R. Hoff.

It was an hour after the men's work day was to have ended.

The Governor abolished the practice for himself years ago.

Dempsey shook his head and asked whether Hoff would go into the field.

Probably not, the Governor was told.

Then, he climbed aboard, weary from the strenuous day that left younger men dragging their heels.

But he had seen the camp. He had seen the men. And, he thought, they knew the state cared for them.

Grand Canyon Dams and the Internal Revenue Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, many citizens in all parts of the country have been shocked by recent Internal Revenue Service action which threatened to choke off public debate on the proposed Grand Canyon dams.

This Internal Revenue Service action was the subject of a petition submitted to the President by participants in the

Tenth Urban Design Conference, which was held at Harvard University on June 18, 1966.

Since this issue is of immediate concern to Members of Congress, I include the text of this petition and the accompanying letter, from Mr. Charles W. Eliot, in the RECORD for consideration by my colleagues:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF DESIGN,
Cambridge, Mass., June 21, 1966.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The petitions enclosed herewith express the deep concern of the signers over what appears to be pressure by the Internal Revenue Service to deny to those opposed to the construction of two dams in the Grand Canyon, their rights to present their views to the public.

The papers for these petitions were made availble for signature to persons attending the 10th Urban Design Conference at Harvard University on June 18, 1966. Following the Conference, the undersigned was asked to transmit these petitions for your attention.

Very respectfully submitted.

CHARLES W. ELIOT.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: According to the New York Times, The Internal Revenue Service, has threatened the Sierra Club, "a society of energetic and outspoken conservationists", with withdrawal of their tax-exempt status, following immediately upon the Club's newspaper advertisements alerting the public to the proposed dams affecting the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River.

We join with The Times' editorial declaration that "this is a new and thoroughly unfair procedure, comparable to inflicting punishment before guilt is established" and that "the Internal Revenue Service's action looks suspiciously like harassment and intimidation."

We urge you to instruct the I.R.S. to rescind this action forthwith.

(The undersigned architects, landscape architects, planners and teachers whose concern is the orderly handling of our environment.)

Peter E. Gulley, Thomas B. Faberli, Ted Hunter, Nelson Chin, Jerry W. Dodger, Howard Brooks, David Rathsham, P. L. Outriz, A. Stevenson.

David Lewis, John Andrew Gallery, James D. Jensen, Francis A. Gildea, Donald J. Tusdall, William W. Joseph, Luella A. Nathan, Lucy Rapperport, Marian K. Newberg, P. Zack Ridley, Ralph D. Peterson, Richard D. Foster.

Joseph Wasserman, Marion Henneberg, Peter Garland, Chet Quinlian, Richard A. Geier, Paul John Grayson, Terrence H. Boyle, Lawrence E. Coff, John Smith.

Joseph B. Thomas II, Peter Holmer, O. Robert Simms, Barclay Jones, Paul G. Felony, R. C. Umlant, William I. Neslef, R. Dean Murdith, Alexander Roman, Aldo von Wolurn, Alexandra Knoff, ——— ———.

Gordon T. Milde, Felix C. Okinani, James D. Houlbe, Edmund N. Stearns, D. Newton Glick, Charles W. Harris, Myles Boylan, Philip H. Lewis, Jr., Walter L. Creese, Chartier Newton, Irvin H. Zabe, Edward J. Tibin.

Edward Baum, Edward R. Bing, Hanson Jackson, Polly Jackson, H. Carthiary, Charles Pearman, Robert S. Sturgis, Boston; Charles W. Hobbeg, Walter L. Collin, Sanford S. Furness, Klaus Hebday, Oscar Garity.

Charlton Williams, Stuart L. Lodi, Alonzo Aaronson, Donald C. Richardson, Bernard Newman, Jose W. Braiux, W. G. Lenhoff, Chester D. Cramer, Joseph F. Shoppe, W. G. Darbie, Jr., J. W. Gilfillan.

Hal M. Moseley, Jr., John E. Nichols, Robert A. Little, Alexander S. Cochran, Benjamin Thompson, Russ H. Renehall, James L. Harris, Paul Hups, Joe Sinclair, David K. Chaplain, Jerome K. Duthelm, Robert E. Dienbene.

Robert Eiddes, Thomas A. Remer, William Homo, Wm. Waterman, Albert Spahn, Roy B. Mann, Paul E. K. Du, Milton J. Conklin, Mary R. Doebele, Howard F. Tetlier, Norman Hoberman, Joseph Deliver, John Walker.

Charles W. Elor, Herman H. Field, John Stanton, James Blumenfeld, Donald A. Kennedy, Douglas Haskell, Elmon Brown, D. Skylar, Harold Bush-Brown, Christides H. Millar.

Kenneth A. Sudl, John M. Morse, William O. Halsey, Margelo Carson, Armenz Chaterin, David, Baruch, Vay H. Osteen, David K. Specter, Catherine H. Powell.

——— ———, Margaret Wadsworth, Christopher D. Wadsworth, Pryor Montgomery, Bernard H. Spring, Dyerin Talpass, Martin Gorson, George M. Nolton, Jr., Peter B. Dorary, Carl D. Detwilder.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereo (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Promising Career Cut Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES P. FARNSLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, the promising career of one of our most able young newspapermen, Robert Worth Bingham, the assistant to the publisher of the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times, tragically ended as the result of a freak automobile accident on July 12.

In this connection I would like to include in the Record an excellent article by Norman E. Isaacs that appeared in the Courier-Journal on July 13.

Worth Bingham, 1932–66: A Promising Career Cut Short

(By Norman E. Isaacs)

It was the summer of '52, I think. He was on the news staff as a trainee. That morning he'd come to work in tennis shoes, dungarees and an old shirt. One look and he was on "the carpet."

"Worth," he was told, "nobody works for these newspapers looking like that. You go home and get some decent clothes on. Either be back in an hour—or don't bother to report."

Worth Bingham made it back in 40 minutes.

Fourteen years later he was a hard-working, well-dressed assistant to the publisher. Thursday night he stayed down at the office to have dinner with the copy desk staff. There was good-humored jesting, some of it about himself, and serious newspaper talk. He enjoyed both. Friday morning he flew off for vacation in Nantucket.

WELL BACKGROUNDED

Then on Monday afternoon he phoned from Nantucket to report on a negotiation dealing with some future planning. He added happily, "The weather here is gorgeous."

Less than 24 hours later, Worth Bingham was dead, victim of a freak accident, just as was his younger brother, Jonathan, only two years before.

The potential for Worth was a career as one of America's great editor-publishers. He'd prepared well. After Harvard and the Navy, he'd broken in on the Minneapolis papers, writing obits, covering police, doing rewrite. He got his first big break when he was sent to Wisconsin on a lurid murder story. The old pros of the Chicago and Detroit papers were busy making sure the police officials were "tied up" for their purposes. Worth went off on his own and got the big story.

Later, in San Francisco, he worked on two papers there, editing copy and writing headlines. It was out there that he met a pretty art student and it was there that they were married.

SERVED IN WASHINGTON

His years of Minneapolis and West Coast experience complete, he returned to the Louisville newspapers, first to work on the desks and in political reporting, and then to the Washington Bureau, where he worked long and hard mastering the intricacies of coverage in the nation's capital.

His series, "Our Costly Congress," which was reprinted all across the country and in Reader's Digest, took endless hours of research. And he wrote, and rewrote, and rewrote himself.

Returning once again to Louisville, he went out on the circulation trucks and knocked on doors, trying to sell subscriptions. Later he sold ads. Once a merchant didn't quite get his name and proceeded to denounce "the Binghams" up one side and down the other. Worth listened to it all with a wry grin on his face.

The training complete, he joined the executive staff. As a member of the editorial conference, he showed he had ideas, he expressed them, and he fought for them. And if it took a 12- or 14-hour day that was all right with him. In short he had a passion for newspapering—and there just wasn't any reason to doubt that he was going to wind up as one of the top figures in journalism.

He was a big, ruggedly handsome man, who had a little of many things mixed up in him—aggressiveness and shyness, pride and humility, reticence and forthrightness. He had great poise, and the indefinable gift of charm.

There were three things that stood out about Worth. One was his dedication to newspapering. The second was his fascination with politics. The third was his addiction to keeping fit. In all of these things, he played to win. At bridge, he could be the picture of elation and dejection within the space of minutes. He would groan loudly over his own misplays—and complain bitterly about losing a dollar.

DISDAINED APPEARANCES

It wasn't the dollar because he came very close to being unconscious about money generally. He just hated to lose.

Appearances meant nothing to him. He drove what others around the office looked on as an old wreck. It was a big station wagon that had a distinct air of semidecreptitude. For a long time, the back portion contained a crib.

The fitness kick was quite something. Often he'd spend a lunch hour playing squash. He played tennis, golf, loved to ski, surfboarded. It was a surfboard that snapped forward yesterday, killing him instantly.

Of all his newspaper work away from Louisville, he loved Washington most. Part of this was because of the political atmosphere. Part, too, was that he worked there during the Kennedy era and Worth and Joan fitted perfectly into the setting. And he made deep and close friends all through the place.

As the friend on the phone said yesterday from The Washington Post, his office probably was just like our own: "Numb."

Protecting the Criminal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the light of the recent news surrounding a mass murder in Chicago I think an editorial which appeared on TV Station WBTW in Florence, S.C., on June 24, is particularly pertinent. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Protecting the Criminal" be printed in the Appendix of the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Protecting the Criminal

Last week the Supreme Court of the United States issued another of its famous landmark rulings, one which, we assume, was widely applauded by the nation's criminal element. This time the high Court reaffirmed that Prosecutors may not use damaging statements or confessions against a suspect unless they can prove that he was safeguarded against self-incrimination.

This all came about when a Chicago man, Danny Escobedo, was accused of murdering his brother-in-law, confessed, was convicted and jailed. He was released from jail when the Supreme Court ruled that the confession was invalid because Danny had been denied the right to Counsel and had not been cautioned that his statement could be used against him.

The current Court ruling is an expansion on its 1964 Escobedo case. It would be nice to report that Danny was a model family man, unjustly accused, who panicked into making a confession and that the Court had saved him from twenty years in prison. But Danny had several brushes with the law before being jailed on the murder rap and now he's back in Court again in Chicago, charged with gun carrying. His court-appointed lawyer says that as a defense he's going to use the Court's ruling in Danny's murder case.

About now you should be getting the idea that we're being extremely careful to protect the rights of those accused of crimes. But who's to speak up in favor of victims? On the heels of the Court's ruling, which makes it just about impossible for an able policeman to get any information from a suspect, the FBI issued its latest edition of the Uniform Crime Report. In the South, comparing the first three months of 1966 and 1965 we find Murder up 7%; Forcible Rape up 6%; Robbery and Aggravated Assault up 11%; Burglary and Auto Thief both up 5% and Larceny, involving $50,000 and over, up 13%.

If criminal suspects keep their mouths shut, and they'll quickly learn to do this before the arrival of their court-appointed, tax-paid attorneys, then police investigators will have to depend on witnesses and circumstantial evidence.

South Carolina SLED Chief J. P. Strom manfully exhibited a stiff upper lip by ruefully commenting, "It's not going to break our spirits as law enforcement officers. We're still going to enforce the law conscientiously". Florence Detective Gene Lessmeister said, "It's the public and taxpayers who are going to suffer and pay and they should, in some way, protest the new ruling".

Just as we have always taken a position favoring states' rights in the face of growing federal power, we assert the right of the individual to resist and be protected from tyranny. However, we didn't have in mind imposing a tyranny of protected criminals over defenseless law-abiding citizens, and by a slim 5 to 4 Supreme Court Decision at that. Something has got to be real bad wrong somewhere.

Conservative, Liberal Seek Pornography Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, in the July 26 edition of the Washington Evening Star there is an article by the nationally syndicated columnist, James J. Kilpatrick, which points out the key roles played by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels] and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] in getting legislation enacted which will set up a study group to consider the problem of pornography.

Mr. Speaker, I think this House and this Nation are very fortunate to have a man of the caliber of our colleague from Hudson County, N.J., looking into the problem of pornography. Mr. Daniels has been a member of the bar of the State of New Jersey for 36 years and for many years served as a magistrate on the Jersey City municipal bench. His long experience with the law and his judicial temperament are ideally suited for the role which he has assumed. He is neither a fanatic nor a zealot and any study which he conducts is certain to be a factfinding inquiry and not a witch hunt. There is no Member of this House who is more respected than the gentleman from New Jersey and the fact that he is sponsoring this legislation has attracted support to the bill from Members who might not, if the bill were championed by some one other than the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels], be so willing to support the measure.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Education and Labor Committee will give speedy approval to the Daniels bill.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the Record, Mr. Kilpatrick's article.

The article follows:

CONSERVATIVE, LIBERAL SEEK PORNOGRAPHY STUDY

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

A Republican conservative from South Dakota and a Democratic liberal from New Jersey, poles apart on most issues, have taken the leadership jointly in urging a serious congressional inquiry into the whole murky field of pornography. It seems unlikely, but they may just possibly bring a measure of order to a problem that is in total confusion now.

Senator Karl Mundt's bill to create a study commission on "noxious and obscene matters and materials" passed the Senate on July 11. Rep. Dominick Daniels' almost identical bill is now pending before the full House Labor and Education Committee, after receiving unanimous endorsement from a select subcommittee April 29.

This is the third time in the last seven years that the Senate has passed such a bill. The House never has gone along. This time, Committee Chairman Adam Clayton Powell has promised Daniels that hearings will be held. If enough public support can be generated, Powell may yet be persuaded to push the proposal along.

Several reservations have to be voiced about the Mundt-Daniels bill itself; and those who have serious apprehensions about government censorship will be a little wary about endorsing even a congressional study that seeks to define something as undefinable as "obscenity." Yet both sides to this controversy—those who despise commercially peddled filth, and those who defend absolute freedom of press—include decent men and women. Neither side has a monopoly on virtue or on fanaticism either. And it is conceivable that both sides could benefit if a genuinely searching and thoughtful investigation were undertaken

The commission envisioned under the pending bills, unfortunately, may be so elaborately concocted that it will bog down in its own individual ruts. The idea is for the President to appoint three members from the clergy, two from the Department of Justice, and two from the Post Office, plus one senator, one representative, one educator (secondary), one educator (higher), one librarian, one publisher (books), one publisher (magazines), one state attorney general, one city prosecutor, one local police chief, one man from the movies, one man from radio-TV and one from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This earnest foolishness stems from the thinking of men who imagine that if only you put together three potatoes, two onions, two carrots, and a pound of cubed beef, you will have a palatable stew. Something more is required; and in this case, it is mainly the labor of a few intelligent men able to see this complex problem whole and entire, and not through little labeled windows. If the President should appoint 20 pre-frozen members with neatly packaged attitudes, the foes of smut will consistently outvote the defenders of freedom by 13–7 or 12–8, and nothing useful will have been accomplished.

That reservation to one side, the Mundt-Daniels proposal in itself is sound. All that is asked under the pending legislation is a study. The idea is to look into the "origin, scope, and effects" of the traffic in pornographic materials. The commission would examine the conflicting and overlapping local, state, and federal laws in the field. In the end, it would formulate recommendations "for such legislative, administrative, or other forms of action as may be deemed necessary to combat such traffic."

Now, if such an investigation were undertaken by broad-gauged men—men who understand enough of freedom to know that freedom can indeed be abused—a legislative foundation might be laid on which some sensible new obscenity laws could be erected. The present laws, by and large, are a mishmash, partly derived from the late Inspector Comstock and partly derived from Mr. Justive Brennan. Nobody really knows what pornography is, or what the effects of pornography are, but everybody knows this traffic is a dirty and lucrative racket. The question is: How do you combat the racket without jeopardizing the right of sophisticated adults, in a free society, to obtain reading matter that would shock three clergymen, two postal inspectors, one congressman, and one cop?

The answer does not lie in permitting an honest, God-fearing Nashville officer, acting on his own Bible-belt convictions, to close up "Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?" It doesn't lie in harassing Hugh Hefner's "Playboy" or in prosecuting the nudist magazines. But by the same token, neither is a problem of deep public concern to be resolved through the absolutism of the American Civil Liberties Union, which scoffs at the notion that pornography could have a bad effect on anyone.

It is likely that the problem has no satisfactory answer. In the end, the whole business may have to be left where it is now, in the rough and imperfect hands of jurors who may not know dirt, but who know what offends them. Anyhow, it would do no harm to attempt a comprehensive study that might throw congressional light on a bunch of slugs who thrive in the dark.

James Meredith and the Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the television station in Florence, S.C., has recently made some very pertinent editorial remarks in regard to pending civil rights legislation and recent events in Mississippi. Since broadcast editorials are often overlooked in commenting on this important issue before us, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial broadcast by WBTW, Florence, S.C., on June 17, 1966, be printed in the Appendix of the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JAMES MEREDITH AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

The bushwhacking of James Meredith along a lonely road in Mississippi caused one unexpected reaction, the raising of strong voices of reason in many parts of the country—voices which condemned the shooting but refused to fall into the trap of indicting the entire white population of Mississippi and the South for it. Completely expected and vocal, as usual, was the chorus condemning the shooting and demanding action, such as immediate passage of President Johnson's new Civil Rights Bill with its controversial provisions to eliminate discrimination in the sale and rental of real estate.

Since there's considerable Northern opposition to this provision we fail to see how passage would single out the South for punishment. Representing this position though is Dr. Benjamin Payton, a spokesman for the National Council of Churches, who said, "The shotgun pellets that wounded James Meredith, it is hoped, will have stung our Congress into performing quickly the duty set so clearly before it."

It should be pointed out that James Meredith started out from Memphis on a march to Jackson to dramatize Negro voter registration. We were not aware that he was trying to drum up support for the new Civil Rights Legislation which is presently stalled in the House Judiciary Committee following its well-reported public hearings.

There's even some question in the ranks of Negro leaders as to whether Negro voter registration needed the kind of impetus James Meredith figured on providing with his interrupted march to Jackson. Charles Evers, the State Director of the Mississippi NAACP, said he didn't think that marches from Memphis to Jackson were going to get any Negroes registered and that the money being spent on plane tickets and campouts should be spent on registration.

This naturally raises the question of how much of a problem is Negro voter registration in Mississippi. On the one hand a spokesman for the National Council of Churches is saying that because Meredith was shot on a voter registration march, vengeance requires immediate passage of the new Civil Rights bill. On the other hand the Council is saying that it plans no duplication of its previous efforts when it trained some 600 Northern College students as Civil Rights workers to participate in so-called Community Action programs in Mississippi. Evidently on the grounds that such an effort in voter registration is not required. We wonder, therefore, how many people are going to buy the idea that the unfortunate shooting of James Meredith, in the course of a provocative and lonely march to encourage Negro interest in voting, requires the passage of legislation which would severely limit your ability to dispose of your real estate. The police have charged Meredith's assailant. All that is required is that he receive a fair trial and that a jury should render an honest verdict.

Abdication of the Majority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, now that we are for the seventh or eighth time in the last 12 years—it has been so frequent we have lost count—considering so-called civil rights legislation designed to placate marauders in the streets and on the highways, I think it most appropriate that a recent column written by Holmes Alexander be included in the Record. I commend it to the reading and consideration of those who still clamor for more so-called civil rights legislation. In so doing I express the hope that everyone will soon get a belly full of this civil rights junk and allow government, Federal and local, to return to a state of normalcy under the leadership and guidance of the majority which now is being driven to the woods and the suburbs.

Mr. Alexander's column follows:

ABDICATION OF THE MAJORITY

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—"Whatever happened to majority rule in the United States?" asked the Returning Traveler, who had been away for a while. "Did a small but superior group arise?"

Not exactly, he was told. The 12 per cent which disrupted America was inferior in education, in property and in just about any way you can measure good citizenship. They were even divided among themselves. Some favored violence, some were for non-violent demonstrations. Others were willing to let progress take its course.

"Then," said the Traveler, "it must be that the militant forces in the minority took to the forests and rural areas and finally beat down the majority by the standard guerrilla tactics."

On the contrary, he was informed, the minority took over the cities, including the Capital City. It drove out its opponents, who retreated to the suburbs and tried to establish new settlements to bring up their children. There remained behind little more than a garrison of the majority.

"The city of Washington is not typical," said the Traveler. "Even if the minority overcame the majority in the nation's capital, there is no reason why the same thing had to happen in other cities."

The Traveler was told that, nonetheless, the loss of majority rule had happened in nearly all the major cities.

"From what you are telling me," declared the Traveler, "the disappearance of majority rule in the United States occurred by abdication."

There was a good deal in what the Traveler was saying, he was told. The 88 per cent had certainly been docile and foolish. It sustained TV programs which publicized the rioters. It made big sellers of books which virtually called for revolution-in-the-streets. It accepted the systematic degradation of the police as an institution in this country. It tolerated a progressive weakening of the anti-criminal procedures.

The majority allowed its two major parties to give way to the nagging of the minorities.

Said the Returning Traveler, "I have seen many countries where a minority could set up a tyranny. But it would always have the advantages that make for power—guns, stolen money, education—while keeping the masses in ignorance. But never have I seen a minority armed mainly with switchblades, largely dependent for money upon charity, composed to a great extent of educational dropouts—never have I seen such a minority push a well-armed, wealthy and highly cultured majority out of its cities and out of power."

"Did not people back in 1966 realize it was time to assert law and order? Didn't they know that if they didn't govern the country, it wouldn't be governed at all?"

There was no need to reply to the Returning Traveler.

Racial Troubles in Parts of the Nation *Outside the South*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, recently there appeared two outstanding editorials in South Carolina in regard to some of the racial troubles in parts of the Nation outside the South. I think these editorials to be singularly important to this present situation and ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Alias Martin Luther," appearing in the Columbia State on July 13, 1966, and the editorial entitled "Race Ills Challenge Journalism," appearing in the Greenville News on Thursday, July 14, 1966, be printed in the Appendix of the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, July 13, 1966]

ALIAS MARTIN LUTHER

Sooner or later, it was bound to happen—Martin Luther King's publicity stunt of posting a set of demands on some public building.

The gimmick, of course, is the ostensible parallel between last Sunday's exhibition at Chicago's City Hall and the original performance by the real Martin Luther almost 450 years ago. On October 31, 1517, the great German religious reformer posted on the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg a bill of particulars ("The 95 Theses") against clerical abuses of the Roman Catholic system of indulgences.

What makes this latter-day performance all the more shoddy is the fact that the Negro agitator was not really named after Martin Luther at all. Both he and his father before him started out in life as *Michael* Luther King and *Michael* Luther King Jr. Not until the younger King was entering boyhood was the Michael dropped in favor of Martin.

Whatever motive lay behind the change is not a matter of record so far as we know, but the renaming proved to be a veritable bonanza for young King when he projected himself into the civil rights movement with his bus-boycott activity at Montgomery. From then on, the "Martin Luther" handle was a passport to publicity.

The name change was simply the first of a series of frauds which King has perpetrated on the people of the United States—and of the world. While piously preaching "nonviolence," he has planted seeds of racial discord which have erupted destructively in communities across the face of the land—usually *after* King has moved on impassively to other fields to repeat the performance.

He has brought together under the high-sounding title of the "Southern Christian Leadership Conference" a motley collection of hot-heads, parlor pinks, Red-tinged activists, and black nationalists whose manifest goal is racial unrest, not racial amity.

Perhaps this is a time for posting a new indictment against indulgences. Certainly the American people have too long indulged Michael (called Martin) Luther King and his ilk.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 14, 1966]

RACE ILLS CHALLENGE JOURNALISM

Newsmen and commentators constantly examine and criticize conditions in the community, state, nation and world. This is a necessary function of constructive journalism.

There are times when the journalism profession also should search its own soul—and this is one of those times. So we hope the reader will bear with us—and perhaps join us—as we examine our journalistic conscience in an important matter.

Responsible American journalism is up against a stern challenge which must be met by all newspapers, magazines and radio and television stations. It is the challenge of full, factual reporting of the serious racial crisis now building in this country, without irritating its causes.

What we have to say here applies particularly to the radio and TV networks, which have not begun to master the fine art of presenting the flow of the news in a straightforward manner, and to certain "news" magazines which make no effort to distinguish between fact and opinion for the reader's sake and whose opinions are clearly biased.

Journalism is a profession of the highest order. Its importance is emphasized by the "freedom of the press" clause in the Constitution of the United States. The fate of the nation rests in a large degree upon how well and how wisely the "press" informs and influences the American public which controls the destinies of the country.

In times of crisis, this professional responsibility increases to awesome proportions. There are times when the newsman must wrestle with his conscience to determine where his highest responsibility lies and how to meet it.

At times there is a soul-wrenching conflict between the journalist's desire to get a story first and complete and his responsibility to avoid inciting more of the same sort of news with unnecessary and lurid detail.

This conflict now confronts American journalism as racial unrest builds. We are approaching the point of a greater national crisis in race relations.

It must be recognized that sustained, widespread race rioting and sabotage in major cities would disrupt American life and weaken the nation dangerously. Outside enemies would be tempted to seize the opportunity to deliver a fatal strike.

Indeed there is evidence that some subversive elements in racial unrest are linked with and controlled by an intercontinental revolutionary movement based in Cuba and supported by both the Soviet Union and Red China.

In handling this situation as it develops in major American cities, the news media bear an almost crushing responsibility to report in moderation, as well as in complete accuracy. Perspective and restraint are all-important.

The national press, especially the broadcast networks, cannot afford the luxury of handling the big city situation as it has handled racial unrest in the South. On the contrary the national media should give sober reflection to the results of inflammatory, sensational, all-out, highly competitive reporting upon many Southern communities.

Every attempt should be made to avoid the shameful abuses which were documented in Little Rock, Birmingham, Selma, New Orleans and elsewhere across the South.

This time it is not simply the peace of Southern communities; it is the peace and safety of the whole nation which can be affected.

This is no time to turn hordes of reporters and cameramen loose on every street brawl which erupts. This is no time for kleig lights to arouse demonstrators. This is no time to give full "coverage" to every publicity-seeking radical who wants to stir up trouble.

The zeal of competitive reporting in a highly-competitive field must not get the better of mature journalistic responsibility in this dangerous situation.

The leadership of American journalism has every reason—and it must be given credit and support for trying—to lay down reasonable but firm norms for all to follow in this sensitive area of the news. Perhaps the time has come for "pool" reporting of racial violence by cooperative news media.

We have seen such arrangements work in potentially explosive situations, with a few selected and competent reporters, photographers and broadcasters gathering and sharing the complete and accurate story. Only the networks and national publications who are the worst offenders object loudly to this method of being served by the local newspapers, broadcast stations and regional wire service personnel.

At the very least it is the solemn obligation of American journalism to report whatever may come in calm, restrained fashion; avoiding rumors and lurid detail which could create more unrest; and shunting aside all attempts to use the journalistic profession as a propaganda vehicle.

This newspaper speaks with some experience in this matter. We have "been there" when racial violence threatened in this area and others. We reported what happened, but avoided sensationalism and dire predictions which could contribute to more trouble. We refused to be used for propaganda purposes by anybody on any side of any controversy.

Recognizing their dual responsibility for reporting well and influencing wisely, this is the course which all news media should follow in the dangerous months, maybe years, which may lie immediately ahead.

Readers, listeners and viewers, likewise, have their own responsibility in this matter. They must receive the news in perspective and with their own sense of balance. They should choose their sources of news with understanding and consider the credibility and motives of those who figure in the events, movements and policies reported.

Remarks of Hon. John E. Fogarty Before the Rhode Island Heart Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY, RHODE ISLAND HEART ASSOCIATION, PROVIDENCE, R.I., FEBRUARY 28, 1966

It is always a much appreciated privilege and abiding pleasure to meet with my friends and colleagues of the Rhode Island Heart Association.

Every event in which I have been associated with you, and they are many, has been a memorable one. But his evening's occasion surely outranks every one so far, because we are celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of our heart association.

This quarter of a century has meant much for us. When the Rhode Island Heart Association was beginning, I was myself new in Congress; and we have grown and developed together.

Let me recall a talk I made here in 1958 at a special educational meeting involving the heart surgery club. I was able then to recount dramatic advances in heart surgery, new drugs for high blood pressure, rheumatic fever prevent programs, cardiac rehabilitation and work evaluation services, and other areas.

The heart association had transformed apathy into interest, given new hope to people, and begun to provide urgently needed services.

As a needed service, the heart association—in partnership with physicians, local and state official agencies, and the National Heart Institute—was giving people vital public information about heart disease: what it was, what could be done, and how and where they could get help.

In the light of these achievements, which continue today just as vitally and needfully, a recent attack on the heart association stands revealed as utterly off-track and about as intelligent as the actions of the villians in the current TV program called "Batman."

This was published in the Washington, D.C. *Post*, February 8, reporting a talk by Mr. Cleveland Amory before a women's group. The charge, as reported, was that the American Heart Association was spending more money on raising funds than on anything else and that over half of the funds raised last year went for "administration and public information."

Everyone who takes the trouble to become informed, knows that the charge is wrong and vicious.

The heart association accounts to the people for its stewardship of voluntary contributions. This is just as important for a voluntary agency as it is for the National Heart Institute, for example, to account for its tax funds.

The heart fund dollars go in appropriate proportions for research, education, and community services. The proportions for administration and fund raising are in reasonable percentages. They are kept at minimal levels.

When it comes to expenditures for public information, it seems to me that what really counts is the cardinal fact that the endeavors of the association and official agencies have made the American public the best informed in history on heart disease, and what to do about it.

Take, for example, the recent National Health Test conducted on TV. Large percentages of people, surprisingly large percentages, I understand, were reported as answering the heart questions correctly. This showed that millions knew a good deal about heart disease and what they could and should do.

Vital heart information, and all good health information for that matter, is a necessity, not a luxury.

Vital public information goes out through the media of communication and through visits, phone calls, letters, and all the work that heart associations and their allies do. It helps save lives and relieve suffering.

From heart information, a person allays his fears by reading the true facts about high blood pressure or heart murmurs. He understands what modern methods of diagnosis are. He learns about risk factors and how he can increase his chances of avoiding heart disease.

From it, a worried father is helped when he wants to know how funds can be found and where an operation can be done to save his little girl's life.

From it, a man recovering from a heart attack is helped to find out what kind of work he will be able to do.

From it, people learn what is going on in research and what progress is being made in new discoveries and treatments.

These are only a few illustrations, but they are true and make the point.

Actually, though much has been accomplished, much more public education and information are needed. The heart story is never done. It should never stop being told, by you, by the official agencies, by physicians and all health workers, and by each of us who learns and knows it.

As we reach the end of American Heart Month in 1966, we can be proud of helping enlighten people and of our progress.

It has been estimated that over two million lives have been saved in recent years because of research and the application of new knowledge against our major diseases.

If we keep on—strengthening and sharpening the focus of research, training, and community services and facilities—it might be possible to double this number of two million. It would not seem impossible or even improbable that four million lives be saved in the next four years, by 1970—instead of proceeding at the same rate as in the past and reclaiming two million in ten to fifteen years.

Why is this possible?

It can be so because the increasing acceleration of research and manpower training and the widening availability of facilities and services can tremendously increase the Nation's ability to postpone premature disability and claim more lives from untimely death.

Now, I am not the only one of those who look toward this—and my optimism is based on that of authorities more skilled than I in predicting. There are some, of course, who would rather groan about darkness than raise a shade to let the sun in. But I believe that a positive approach is better than a negative one.

Present gains lend credence and strength to such a view. There have been real death rate reductions in such areas as rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease, strokes, and high blood pressure. There are burgeoning programs, which I have been privileged to lead and assist in Congress, such as the acts for community facilities, health research facilities, community health services extension, community mental health centers, health professions education, and heart disease, cancer and stroke regional medical programs. These promise much for the future, given appropriate funds, careful administration, and state and local execution in accordance with sound, established patterns of medical care, training, and services.

What are some realizable goals for our present and future attack? The possibilities in coronary heart disease and high blood pressure are examples of great potential progress.

More than 500,000 die each year from coronary heart disease; and it is our toughest and greatest heart enemy. But we might well set a goal of from ten to twenty percent annual reduction in these deaths for the next few years—saving 50,000 to 100,000 a year. Prospects for such an advance appear encouraging through a number of approaches.

Drugs and hormones may reduce the incidence or prevent recurrences of coronary heart disease and its heart attacks. We have succeeded in getting launched a cooperative study of some of these promising agents to really test them out.

Mechanical devices to temporarily assist the heart acutely damaged by a heart attack should be here within the next few years. Within the foreseeable future a totally implantable artificial heart may be feasible. This program for the research and development of an artificial heart is now launched and should result in the saving of many thousands of lives annually.

Coronary care units and improvements in bio-engineering and instrumentation will lead to the saving of many other thousands through providing instant, comprehensive, and continuous care through critical periods.

A number of surgical procedures show great promise for improving blood flow to the heart muscle, adding to the number who can be helped.

Drug research will probably develop drugs to retard clot formation or to dissolve clots; and we are hopeful for cooperative clinical trials of such promising agents as urokinase. Such a therapeutic agent could add many more thousands of reclaimed lives.

Diagnostic techniques that will spot trouble faster and more accurately are sure to come, ranging from improved motion picture X-rays of coronary arteries, blood flow measurement in them, and sensitive chemical tests to the use of computers and portable, continuous electrocardiographic recorders. Prompter and better detection will also lead to substantial reductions in coronary deaths.

High blood pressure is another enemy against whom we can set new goals.

Over 69,000 died from hypertension in 1964; and many millions suffer from it. Although the death rate from high blood pressure has been reduced over fifty percent in recent years, it is, therefore, still a vast problem.

In the next few years, an increasing variety of curable or remediable kinds of hypertension can be defined by intensive studies. Also, as new diagnostic measures are developed, better and more specific treatments will result. There should be inexpensive, effective, easily administered drugs, without side effects of significance. Thus, it is not too much to set goals of further, substantial death rate reductions.

There are other exciting possibilities in rheumatic fever, rheumatic heart disease, congenital heart disease, and other heart and blood vessel conditions. But these examples concerning the two major categories show that we can seek realizable goals for greater gains than ever before.

Now, how can we attain such goals?

There are several essentials. There is the matter of teamwork. It is a most important factor; and the attack on heart disease has been characterized by this American approach.

We in Congress will do everything possible to further the cooperative spirit and approach—and we are, in a sense, members of the health team. Federal, state, and local public agencies are likewise partners. But, without the doctors, other health professional people, and the heart associations in the places where people live, the bold goals that I have mentioned would be unattainable.

The Rhode Island Heart Association, other state affiliates, and the American Heart Association are in the vanguard of agencies that have learned how to work in teamwork.

This means that you should play a key role in seeing to it that things get done and done well, as a cooperative endeavor mobilizing all potential resources.

Sometimes, the question is asked, "In view of the increasing Federal programs, is there a role for the voluntary health agency?"

I think that you know the answer is a vigorous, "Yes!"

The heart association has proved itself; it has been indispensable to progress to date, and will continue to be so. The official agencies are also essential, just as are the medical and health professions. The strong combination of these resources is abolutely necessary to maximum advances.

But the need for the voluntary effort and the heart fund is an imperative one. Needs cannot and should not ever be met entirely by tax funds.

People want to support the fight against heart disease—and all disease. They want an all-out attack by their government, medical and health professions, *and their* voluntary agencies.

Such causes as the heart fund are, therefore, both necessary and important. The voluntary program provides opportunity for the individual to give freely to the area of his choice. It avoids hazards that lie in complete dependency upon programs supported solely by public monies. It encourages and guides the endeavors of others. It is an effective partner for all the groups that comprise our health resources.

Also, and very importantly, the heart association provides opportunity for personal participation, for services in a direct and individual way. Those who work on behalf of the heart association and those who contribute to the heart fund do so of their own free will—and maintain the unique American tradition that is a prime source of our Nation's strength.

The heart association has other essential values. It adapts rapidly to changing needs and circumstances and is quickly responsive to new demands in research, in education, and community programs.

The whole history of the heart association has been one of meeting such demands and challenges. I am confident that this will continue and that people will continue to give increasing support.

In the long run, all the heart association and government efforts are based on the cooperation of the scientific and medical community, the Congress, and the public. In this context, each heart agency, public and private, views the other as essential not only to its own continued growth and development, but also to the achievement of the mutual aim of the conquest of heart disease.

The resources of all are needed to do the job; and the size of the task and the challenging goals warrant our maximum effort. This is a war for health which we should escalate as much as possible as soon as possible.

If we do, long before the Rhode Island Heart Association's golden anniversary we shall have attained heights of success undreamed of now. Just as, twenty-five years ago, none of us could have dreamed that we would be where we stand today, so it is not possible now to imagine all that will be accomplished in the coming years.

But we can be sure that many new gains will be made and we can be certain that the Rhode Island Heart Association will do its share to achieve them, alert to opportunities and responsive to the needs of the Community, of families, and of individuals.

Fair Housing and Jury Selection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, recent hearings on the so-called civil rights bill have elicited so much comment throughout the Nation that it is hard to know just which comments are worthy of inclusion in the Congressional Record; however, the editorial broadcast by WBTW on July 1 and July 8 dealing with the open housing provision and with the jury selection provision of this proposed legislation are particularly apt and to the point; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials regarding fair housing and jury selection be printed in the Appendix of the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Television station WBTW editorial, July 1, 1966]

THE OPEN HOUSING PROPOSAL

There's been so much said lately about civil rights it's hard to believe that any area at all is to be exempt from federal legislation designed to enforce a right to something. The latest in a series of Washington legislative attempts to enforce another so-called right is the Open Housing provision in the new Civil Rights package. This says in effect that the owner of housing property may not discriminate when renting or selling his property, otherwise he'll find himself in Court as a defendant with the Government financing the suit against him.

A spokesman for the National Association of Real Estate Boards told a Senate Subcommittee that the law now being considered by Congress could prevent an owner of a house for sale from advertising that it was near a Baptist Church or a Parochial school since this would seem to indicate preference for a purchaser of a particular religious faith.

Now it is true that the open housing provision of the new Civil Rights Bill is designed to prevent racial discrimination when housing is sold or rented. But let's take a closer look at the rights involved and attempt to determine whose rights are being trampled on. It's always been part of the definition of property that the owner can dispose of it as he sees fit, subject to the common good, as sometimes set forth in zoning regulations.

The framers of the Open Housing proposal are now saying that a home owner has no right to refuse a buyer for any reason if that buyer would agree to pay the asking price. But if we're going to talk about the common good, what's so bad about protecting an owner's right to sell, as opposed to creating, by law, an unheard of right to buy.

We treasure our free speech in spite of the many abuses of it, especially by mouthy supporters of the far right or the far left. It seems to us that the right to dispose of our property, as we choose, should be defended even though there are and will be cases of racial or religious discrimination when property is rented or changes hands.

As free speech is guaranteed by the Constitution so also are your property rights. This is, they were until Government Attorneys decided that the Interstate Commerce Clause in the Constitution should take precedence.

On Wednesday of this week the House Judiciary Committee voted to exempt homeowners who sell or rent, up to two transactions a year, plus units of up to four family size, provided the owners live in them. But as Senator DIRKSEN pointed out this is still a partial liquidation of Constitutional due process and fails on the grounds of basic principle. We agree with Senator DIRKSEN. You can't compromise. The open housing proposal is a bad one and should be cut out of the bill entirely.

[Television station WBTW Editorial, July 8, 1966]

JURY SELECTION AND CIVIL RIGHTS

We're indebted to former North Carolina Governor, Terry Sanford, for reminding us that there's more to the 1966 Civil Rights Bill than the well-publicized open housing provision. In an address to the North Carolina Bar Association's Annual meeting last week in Myrtle Beach Governor Sanford pointed out that the Bill's provisions covering jury selection may well be the beginning of federal participation in running the state court systems.

The Federal Government would have the power to suspend any state qualifications for jury duty that discriminate or are susceptible of being applied in a discriminatory way. Specifically the bill says that no person may be denied, on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex, national origin or economic status the right to serve on a jury. There's even a provision for a so-called "Master" who would have the duty of assuring the right to serve on a jury while maintaining records which might be necessary to show proof of discrimination.

You're probably wondering why any one thought such a bill was necessary. In case you've forgotten we'll have to point out that the prime cause for its drawing was the failure of Southern juries to convict in some widely reported cases such as the shootings of Medgar Evers, Mrs. Viola Liuzzo and Lemuel Penn. It's being assumed that the absence of Negroes from the juries involved was one reason for the failure to convict. However, as Governor Sanford pointed out there's no assurance of conviction by making Negroes available for service on such juries. But since at least half the states in the nation use voter registration lists from which to select jurors and since the number of registered Negroes is increasing by leaps and bounds there seems little need for specific legislation.

Currently women do not serve on juries in South Carolina State Courts; in Federal Court, yes, but not in State Courts. While some few homemakers have militantly denounced the state law that prevents them from taking a week off from their household chores to sit around a county courthouse, most women would greet passage of the bill like the storied little old lady who, although she didn't want to go, was helped across the street by an eager boy scout.

We agree that no one should be denied the right to serve on a jury by reason of race, color, religion, sex, national origin or economic status. But note the legislation, how it intrudes the federal government into another area traditionally reserved for the states. Again in a heavy handed attempt to preserve rights in one area the federal government tramples all over them in another. It's the insidious idea that you can fix anything with a little federal legislation that we're objecting to.

Grand Canyon Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest that two newspapers from the Pacific Northwest have recently joined in the effort to preserve the Grand Canyon. The Seattle Times, in a June 29 editorial, points out:

> The Grand Canyon is a record of millions of years of nature's changes. Any man-made changes would only destroy a part of this record.

And the Medford, Oreg., Mail Tribune of June 15 labels the present plan to construct two power dams in the canyon "indefensible—surely on esthetic grounds and, very probably, on practical grounds, should a thorough study of alternatives be made."

The ever-growing number of newspaper editorials and columns—from all over the country—joining in the fight to keep the Grand Canyon unspoiled, seems to me a factor of great significance. Today, I should like to include the editorials from the Times and the Mail Tribune in the RECORD:

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, June 29, 1966]

COLORADO FIGHT: ROUND ONE

Federal Reclamation Commissioner Floyd Dominy says yesterday's 13–5 vote by a House subcommittee in favor of a dam in the Grand Canyon area augurs well for full congressional approval of the project.

Those millions of Americans who have acquired in recent years a renewed interest in protecting the remnants of the nation's scenic outdoor heritage have reason to hope that Dominy is wrong.

The Hualapai Dam, a part of the $1.7-billion Colorado River project approved by the reclamation subcommittee, would create a 92-mile-long lake in the bottom of the canyon, extending through the entire Grand Canyon National Monument.

The reclamation commissioner admits that the dam would change some scenic values, but, he adds, "I do not think it will destroy any of them."

But the Grand Canyon happens to be one of those last remaining areas of special scenic glory—like the heart of the Olympic National Park—in which change is synonymous, to some extent, with destruction.

The Grand Canyon is a record of millions of years of nature's changes. Any man-made changes would only destroy a part of this record.

Dominy argues that the proposed dam would make the Colorado River at Grand Canyon "more beautiful than it was in its natural state." This, to our mind, would be like adding some special coloring to Crater Lake or reshaping the crest of Mount Rainier.

Northwesterners, of course, have a special reason, other than defense of the Grand Canyon, for objecting to the bill approved yesterday by the Southwest-dominated subcommittee.

The bill would authorize studies as a first step toward diverting Northwest water to the Southwest. Furthermore, the measure's sponsors intend that revenues from hydroelectric power produced by the Hualapai Dam and the Marble Canyon Dam, in the same area, would be used to finance the water-diversion project.

Dominy asserts that opponents of these dams are selfish in that "they want to lock up 253 miles (of the canyon) for a few."

A few? Can untold numbers of canyon visitors from among future generations be considered a few?

For that matter, considerably more than a "few" present-day Americans share the sentiments of Representative Thomas S. Foley, a Washington State member of the subcommittee, who says of the battle against the Colorado bill as it now stands:

"We have just begun to fight."

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune, June 15, 1966]

FLOODING THE GRAND CANYON

The Grand Canyon may seem a long way from Oregon. But many Oregonians have visited it, marveled at its pirmitive beauty and grandeur, and taken pride in the fact that is is THEIR Canyon, preserved for all time for future generations to enjoy.

But this noble dream may be destroyed, and if it is, the sanctity of any other National Park is in question.

Congress in on the verge of passing a measure to authorize two new dams in the Grand Canyon which would inundate 130 miles of this great natural feature. Water would be backed up into the National Park itself. Nor are these multi-purpose dams. Their only purpose is to generate auxiliary electric power for industry with the proceeds going to pay for reclamation projects in Arizona.

The Sierra Club is leading the fight against this desecreation of the Grand Canyon for political and industrial purposes. It is putting up a stiff fight, but concedes that the measure probably will pass unless people all over the nation protest to their representatives.

The Club has pointed out that the Bureau of Reclamation, main sponsor of the plan, has been allowed to testify, but that other Interior Department agencies, which feel differently, have not.

It also points out that other sources of power, more efficient and more economical, are available, and that there is reason to doubt that these two huge dams would ever pay for themselves.

Let us first of all concede that Arizona needs more water—as do all southwestern states. But at the same time let it be known that this can be done without sacrificing one of our greatest natural assets.

With today's technology, with the increasing use of atomic power. and with a breakthrough in desalting sea water expected at any time, this plan to ravage the Grand Canyon is indefensible—surely on esthetic grounds and, very probably on practical grounds, should a thorough study of alternatives be made.

The plan should bring an outraged howl of protest from any one who ever has gasped at the sheer majesty of the Grand Canyon—or who hopes that his children and theirs will have an opportunity for similar inspiration.—E.A.

Are the Police Handcuffed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there appeared in the Friday, July 22, 1966, issue of the Augusta Chronicle at Augusta, Ga., a timely and precise editorial entitled "Are the Police Handcuffed?" This excellent editorial clearly sets forth some important questions which all Americans, and particularly Members of the Congress, should consider carefully. Because this is a matter which will require increasing attention, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Are the Police Handcuffed?

Will recent Supreme Court rulings have the effect of giving freedom and immunity to suspects held by the police, by thwarting the adeptness of law enforcement officers in questioning any who are arrested?

That is what the constitutional amendments subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee wants to know, and in order to reach an opinion it scheduled hearings to begin this week. Should the subcommittee reach the conclusion that the Supreme Court has seriously weakened the protection from crime which is due to the public, it could sponsor a constitutional amendment giving police greater freedom in questioning suspects.

Dramatizing the new caution with which police everywhere are handling suspects, in order not to take any action which would be grounds for reversing convictions, is the Speck case. Richard F. Speck was arrested Sunday in connection with the slaying of eight young women three days earlier, in a Chicago nurses' dormitory.

Chicago police already have an eye-witness in the person of one nurse who hid and escaped detection. They have fingerprints. Under the new rules laid down by the Supreme Court, however, the police cannot ask Speck one single question until they have advised him of his right to have a lawyer. They cannot ask one single question unless he agrees to be questioned. They cannot even ask him to tell his own side of the matter and confront him with discrepancies. Chicago police officials declared that they would abide by these restrictions scrupulously.

There may be cases in which eye-witnesses or other factors may be sufficient for conviction, and make questioning by police unnecessary. What about all the cases, though, in which there were no eye-witnesses, no fingerprints and no unsolicited confessions? The investigative processes on which police always have depended might go down the drain, and provide a bonanza of immunity for all but an occasional criminal.

Police and prosecuting attorneys all across the nation have protested that the Supreme Court's rulings stemming from cases appealed and acted on in 1964 and more recently on June 13, 1966, will render much of their work ineffectual.

The subcommittee will seek to determine the degree to which police questioning and confessions are essential. It will examine the potential offered by other methods of establishing guilt, including, for example, new scientific methods such as identifying persons through "voice prints." The subcommittee will no doubt probe the actual methods that have been used in station house questioning, and undoubtedly they will turn up evidence of proper regard for constitutional rights along with an occasional abuse of such rights. Such abuses, it would seem, call for remedies where found, rather than for the drastic blanket action taken by the Supreme Court.

We cannot condone physical maltreatment of suspects, or outright deception. It seems to us, however, that when criminals obviously are going to use their wits in every conceivable degree to escape responsibility for their crimes, the law should permit the police to be equally proficient in protecting the victims and the prospective victims of such crimes.

Sidney Bernstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I knew Sidney Bernstein as one of the leading producers of provocative and thoughtful plays on and off Broadway.

His untimely death will create a void among those producers willing to "take a chance" in the theater with a possible intellectual rather than a financial success.

He was kind and pleasant and a gentleman with none of the flamboyance attributed to Broadway.

He will be missed.

His obituary as taken from the New York Times of Saturday, July 23, 1966, follows:

Sidney Bernstein Is Dead at 56—Produced Off Broadway Plays—Presented "Blacks" by Genet, Which Had 3-Year Run—Also a Theater Manager

Sidney Bernstein, a leading Off Broadway producer, whose interest was "in plays that, loosely speaking, comment—make some comment," died of a heart attack yesterday in St. Vincent's Hospital. He was 56 years old and lived at 55 East Ninth Street.

Mr. Bernstein was co-producer with George Edgar and André Gregory of Jean Genet's "The Blacks." It had 1,408 performances from May 4, 1961, through September, 1964, at the St. Marks Playhouse.

The drama about interracial actions and reactions was, according to Mr. Bernstein, "virtually the only play ever written for Negroes which makes fullest demands on them as artists and actors."

In 1964, he and Lucille Lortel produced "Blood Knot" by Atholl Fugard, a drama about racail tensions in South Africa.

AT UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

"Believe it or not," Mr. Bernstein, a native of Brooklyn, once said in an interview, "I spent two years, 1930 to 1932, at the University of Alabama. My interest in integration started right there."

For this fall, Mr. Bernstein had planned his first productions for Broadway. They were to be a revival of "Native Son," the melodrama on a racial theme adapted from Richard Wright's novel by Paul Green and Mr. Wright, and "The Secret of the World," a tragedy by Ted Allan, to be directed by Sean Connery of the James Bond films.

Mr. Bernstein had worked with the Group Theater, an experimental organization, in the nineteen-thirties and was later a filmwriter in Hollywood.

Returning here, he produced, in 1950–51, an early Off Broadway presentation, "Nat Turner" by Paul Peters. In the 1956–1957 season, he was co-producer of the prize-winning "Volpone." In 1958, he presented Horton Foote's "Midnight Caller" and "John Turner Davis."

In 1959–60, he presented the Off Broadway version of "Summer of the 17th Doll." In 1963 he produced Max Frisch's "The Firebugs."

MANAGED GOLDEN BOY

Last year for a while, Mr. Bernstein managed "Golden Boy," the Sammy Davis musical. He had also been general manager of James Baldwin's "The Amen Corner."

He was known for his kindliness with actors.

Mr. Bernstein was a member of the League of Off Broadway Theaters and of the Association of Theatrical Press Agents and Managers.

Surviving are his widow, the former Brunetta Barnett, and a brother, Leo.

A funeral service will be held Monday at noon at the Universal Funeral Chapel, Lexington Avenue and 52d Street.

Tidy Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, a Utah newspaper appraises the impact of the Federal Government's beautification campaign in that State and concludes the effort will be difficult for some—but justifiable.

Robert H. Woody business editor of the Salt Lake Tribune, remarks in an article on the subject that Utah has nearly 80 percent of its land in the public domain and is particularly susceptible to the "conservation ethic" stressed by Secretary of the Interior Udall. For some, he comments, this will impose agonizing restraints.

But Mr. Woody writes that President Johnson has said in effect: Let there be beauty.

"It may hurt at first," the editor comments. "But in the long run it will be worth it."

As this commentary is applicable to many of our States, I ask that the Tribune article be made a part of the Record.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, July 13, 1966]

Udall Edict To Tidy Up Housekeeping in Utah

(By Roert H. Woody)

"Over a year ago . . . I issued to all Bureau heads an order implementing the President's Natural Beauty Message. I suggest that you remind all of your employes that this order is still in effect and Interior is more concerned than ever in having all of its decisions reflect this memorandum and the criteria set forth by the President in his special messages on conservation."

"It should also be generally known in the department that any officials high or low, who ignore or flout my directive and the President's clear guidelines will not be regarded as individuals who deserve the advancement in a department that takes special pride in its conservation ethic—and the manner in which it implements its decisions."

Thusly in a memo to the upper echelons of the Department of Interior—Secretary Stewart L. Udall makes unmistakably clear that the national housekeeping is going to get more stringent.

Whatever, it's going to cost somebody money and effort—as do all forms of housekeeping. Any harried housewife will tell you.

For those who use the public domain—pipeliners, miners, power companies, seismo crews, grazers, etc.—it means that expediency will have to accommodate aesthetics.

Utah, of course, with nearly 80 per cent of its land classified as "public domain" is particularly subject to the mandates.

The Bureau of Land Management, which falls under the Department of Interior, is responsible for 44 per cent of Utah's acreage.

The Bureau of Reclamation, also an arm of Interior takes care of another sizable chunk. And the Forest Service, under the Department of Agriculture, has several hundred thousand Utah acres in its embrace.

For some users, this conservation ethic is and will continue to impose agonizing restraints. Disciplines applied to coring, drilling, road building, power line erection, trenching, line laying will become even more tighter. And users will argue that the government's touted multiple use philosophies will succumb to a philosophy that seeks to exclude.

The Bureau of Reclamation, which has done no small amount of altering the natural landscape, is no less subject to the new restraints.

Mandates issued to it this year give some indication of what private users may expect.

For example, transmission lines are to take advantage of the natural topography in keeping them concealed from public view.

Contractors are to use designated access roads to eliminate "unsightly temporary roads." Cuts and fills are to be reseeded as soon as posible.

Architecture of buildings should grace the natural environs.

President Johnson has said in effect: Let there be beauty.

It may hurt at first. But in the long run it will be worth it.

Who Cares?—Rivers Cares

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in his brief time as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, L. MENDEL RIVERS has earned himself a reputation as the champion of the GI. This reputation is attested to once again by a telling editorial in the July issue of the Exchange and Commissary News entitled "Who Cares? RIVERS Cares."

As the E. & C. editorial happily puts it, MENDEL RIVERS is determined to keep the American people mindful of the needs of our servicemen. When it comes to defending benefits of our GI's and their families, Chairman RIVERS "mans the bulwarks with similar bulldog tenacity."

It is significant that this editorial appears in E. & C. News. In 4 short years, under the able and independent editorship of John A. Kuett and with outstanding reporting directed by its knowledgeable managing editor, John Neubauer, E. & C. News has become the largest publication in the exchange and commissary field. Its accuracy and its independence are respected.

The editorial follows:

WHO CARES?—RIVERS CARES

The House Armed Services Committee Chairman, L. MENDEL RIVERS (D-S.C.) seems determined to keep Congress and the Administration mindful of the needs of the armed forces.

This has been characteristic of RIVERS since he became chairman of the powerful House group last year. RIVERS is a strong advocate of the belief that the well paid and well equipped soldier makes for a strong defense arm of the Nation. The Chairman takes no back seat on this.

Almost simultaneously with assuming his Armed Services Committee post, RIVERS directed the successful fight for the billion dollar military pay increase over the opposition of the White House, which had recommended only half this amount. But this is typical of RIVERS. Last month his committee handed the Defense Department almost a billion dollars more than was requested under a Defense Appropriations bill to beef up the armed forces.

And when it comes to fringe benefits for the individual military man and his family, Chairman RIVERS mans the bulwarks with similar bulldog tenacity. During the recent GAO assault on comstores RIVERS roared and the GAO backed off.

If anyone should ask who cares, MENDELL RIVERS and the House Armed Services Committee care.

Financial Statement of Hon. Hervey G. Machen, of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a full statement of my financial status. I submit this statement voluntarily and with the reiteration of my firm belief that a strong conflict-of-interest law should be enacted in my home State of Maryland and at a Federal level. I also believe that such a statute should set forth specific guidelines for persons seeking public office.

Prior to my election in 1964, I stated that I had no objection to issuing public financial statements provided that it was the consensus that his should be done. I am pleased that this consensus has arrived and I urge all congressional candidates in Maryland to make public disclosures.

The statement follows:

Hervey G. Machen and Marian D. Machen, his wife—Statement of financial condition, June 30, 1966

Assets:	
Cash (see schedule A)	$10, 295. 99
Investments (see schedule B)	236, 040. 00
Notes receivable	1, 118. 12
Real estate (see schedule C)	155, 000. 00
Automobiles:	
1966 Lincoln	5, 500. 00
1964 Chevrolet	1, 500. 00
Total	7, 000. 00
Household furnishings	4, 000. 00
Law books and office furniture	4, 896. 62
Total assets	418, 350. 73
Liabilities:	
Accounts payable	359. 75
Notes payable (unsecured)	13, 200. 00
Notes payable (secured)	114, 000. 00
Mortgages (see schedule D)	36, 189. 04
Total liabilities	163, 748. 79
Net worth	254, 601. 94

Hervey G. Machen and Marian D. Machen, his wife—Statement of financial condition, June 30, 1966—Continued

Schedule A—Cash

Citizens Bank of Maryland—Savings account	$4, 066. 76
Citizens Bank of Maryland—Checking account	1, 340. 76
Suburban Trust Co.—Checking account	2, 193. 88
Sergeant at Arms checking account	2, 674. 59
Total	10, 295. 99

Schedule B—Investments

	Shares	Market value
Maryland Home Title Co., acquired in August 1954	1	$50
Suburban Trust Co., initial purchase in August 1946, purchases since then have been limited to stock options and stock dividends when capital was increased by the bank	520	36, 400
Citizens Bank of Maryland, initial shares acquired in 1955, for the last 2 years additional purchases have been limited to stock options and stock dividends when capital was increased by the bank	2, 470	190, 190
Metromedia, acquired January 1960	200	9, 400
Total		236, 040

Schedule C—Real estate

Farm, 120 acres at Horsehead, Prince Georges County, Md., acquired August 1957	$60, 000
Personal Residence, 4107 Hamilton Street, Hyattsville, Md., acquired December 1951	36, 000
Summer Home, Broomes Island, Calvert County, Md., 2 acres and house, inherited from father in 1933	22, 000
Unimproved land, 28 acres, one-third interest with sister and brother, inherited from father in 1933, one-third of the value	2, 000
Office building and lot, 4328 Farragut Street, Hyattsville, Md., joint ownership with brother, part law offices and part engineering offices, acquired December 1954, one-half of the value	35, 000
Total	155, 000

Schedule D—Mortgages

Horsehead farm	$15, 500. 00
Personal residence	9, 673. 23
Office building and lot, 4328 Farragut Street, Hyattsville, Md., one-half of balance	11, 015. 81
Total	36, 189. 04

NOTES

Stocks are listed at their market values.

Real estate holdings are listed at their estimated current market values.

I have several group life insurance policies that have no surrender value in the Maryland Bar Association and a $10,000 G.I. Life Insurance Policy that has never been converted.

At the present time, I am and have been a Director of the Citizens Bank of Maryland, having been elected to the Board in January 1960.

I am also a Director of the Maryland Home Title Company.

I am a senior member in the law firm of Machen, Brooks, and Stanbury located at 4328 Farragut Street, Hyattsville, Maryland. Until October 1964, I practiced law as an individual. Having received the Democratic nomination for Congress, I formed a partnership with Thomas R. Brooks and Jerome Stanbury, both of whom have been associated with me either on my payroll or on referral work for some period of time. This was with the understanding that when and if elected to Congress, I would be a full-time Congressman and would not actively participate in the activities of the law firm.

World Court's 4-Year Fumble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, after 4 years of studing a case involving the extension of "apartheid" doctrines into South-West Africa the International Court of Justice at the Hague finally concluded in an 8-to-7 vote that it had no jurisdiction in the case. The Court took 4 years to decide that it should not decide.

I submit for the RECORD the Chicago's American editorial comment on this subject as follows:

WORLD COURT'S 4-YEAR FUMBLE

Strange, confusing court decisions are nothing new; but the International Court of Justice at The Hague has set some knd of record in that line. In its decision to throw out the case of South-West Africa, the court ruled in effect that it had made a mistake four years ago, and the plaintiffs must pay for it. Far from settling the issue, the court did not even attempt to answer any of the questions it brought up—for instance, whether a 1920 mandate by the defunct League of Nations is to be considered still in effect. It merely junked the whole case on a technicality.

The court, which is the United Nations' chief judicial organ, dismissed a complaint by Ethiopia and Liberia. The action was intended to block South Africa's racist government from extending its "apartheid" doctrines into South-West Africa, a territory entrusted to South Africa in 1920 by a League of Nations mandate. There was a deadlock on the issue until Sir Percy Spender of Australia, the court's president, cast the deciding vote; the 8-to-7 decision was that Ethiopia and Liberia could not establish "any legal right or interest" in the question, so there was no case for the court to decide.

The obvious question, then, is why did the court accept jurisdiction in the case in 1962? Why did it keep the question under study for four years, with all parties to it being put to great expense and effort, only to inform them that the evidence couldn't even be examined? The 8-man majority, evidently, feels that the nations appearing before it have only the right to be heard; they have no right to a decision.

The ruling is likely to have extremely bad practical results. The court has in effect upheld South Africa's brutally repressive system of race segregation and censorship and approved its extension; the ruling can only weaken or destory the confidence of new African and Asian nations in the court and the U.N.'s legal process, and impel them to look elsewhere for answers. All this would be defensible if the court had reached a real verdict on legal grounds; its job is to decide questions, not to be popular.

But the world court has taken four years to decide that it can't decide and shouldn't even have been studying the question. A more discreditable performance by a court that is supposed to be settling world questions would be hard to imagine.

National Bowling Champion at Age 19

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago John Wilcox of Williamsport, Pa., was an acolyte in the church which I attend and sang in the boys' choir, at the age of 13. Today he is not only the national bowling champion at the age of 19, but he also just won, in Miami, the men's inter-American championship with an amazing 99 pin lead over his nearest opponent. The following item from the Williamsport Sun-Gazette newspaper describes this outstanding accomplishment in proper prospective:

For nearly three-quarters of a century Williamsport has had its big moments in sports.

It all started just before the turn of the century when Garrett Cochran was named an All-America football player at Princeton University.

It continued last night when the city welcomed John Wilcox back from Miami where he won one bowling championship and shared in another for the United States in international competition against some 25 nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Wilcox, a 19-year-old student of the Williamsport School of Commerce, won the men's singles championship with a 15-game total of 3,040 in the fourth annual Tournament of the Americas. He won by 99 pins over Ramiro Munoz of Juarez, Mexico.

Wilcox also teamed with Dorothy Whitesell of Belleville, Ill., to win the mixed doubles title for the United States.

For these outstanding achievements he was welcomed home in ceremonies held at the Court House Plaza.

It was a "hurry-up" arrangement of some 72 hours, the fine work of Bill Rowles, and it featured a welcoming address by Mayor Raymond M. Knaur who presented the teenage champion and record-breaker with a key to the city.

Despite the brief time for arrangements and publicity, the turnout and enthusiasm were good. And we're sure that once the impact of the job he did in Miami hits home, a more suitable testimonial will be held.

The United States couldn't have come up with a finer representative if the tournament could have been written by a script writer.

John is as wholesome and modest a teenager as can be found. Not only did he win but he accepted everything with humility and pride.

This was evidenced by a Miamian, who covered this newspaper on tournament happenings, and by John himself when he spoke last night. His first words were:

"The parade of all bowlers before the flags of all of the countries really was something. It made you choke up. And then remember why we all can get along with peoples of these countries."

Tommy Barger, lanemaster of the YMCA and a national figure in the 700 Clubs of America, summed up the 19-year-old well.

"John could have been a selfish kid and rode his laurels of winning the ABC all-events title with a sparkling 2,004.

"If he has any idea of turning professional he had everything to lose and was faced with a big gamble. The gamble was to rest on his 2,004 and national limelight or take part in the Miami tournament and risk everything.

"He could finish 22nd or something like that in the tournament, especially with his bad thumb, and then there would have been those around the country who would have called his all-events performance at Rochester just a flash in the pan.

"But John accepted the responsibility and gambled with all the courage of a 19-year-old. You know the rest of the story and all Williamsport and the country are proud of him."

Address by the President of Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on a recent trip to Panama I had the privilege of meeting with and discussing with the President of Panama problems of mutual interest and concern.

The evening before the Fourth of July the President gave an excellent talk in the city of Colon at the Foreigners Club.

I take this time to present this address for the benefit of the membership of the House of Representatives:

SPEECH GIVEN BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRESIDENT, ON JULY 3, AT THE FOREIGNERS CLUB IN COLON

Mr. President of the National Assembly, honorable President of the Supreme Court of Justice, Ministers of State, your Excellency the Ambassador of the United States of America, Honorable Deputies of the National Assembly, Distinguished Civil and Military officials of Panama and the Canal Zone:

Gentlemen: Last night at the banquet given in the El Panama Hilton Hotel by the American Society, I said and, I repeat again, that these banquets held annually in the City of Panama as well as in the City of Colon to commemorate the outstanding dates for the United States and for Panama, I name the "Banquets of cordiality and Friendship". They are banquets of brotherhood where Panamanians and North Americans mix together in a sole communion of ideals.

Last night I said, and I repeat again here, that I am greatly pleased to partiicpate in these civic ceremonies. Gentlemen I feel that it is good that we should rejoice on this date and that the civic pride of all the North American and Panamanian citizens should be enhanced in the commemoration of these dates; so significant to our countries. This is very natural and very logical. But I also feel that during these days of joy and spiritual happiness we should save room for evaluation and meditation.

We should invoke the memory of those men who gave their lives, their efforts, their insight and their minds to the structure and the physiognomy of our countries. We should remember men in the North such as Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson; in the central countries Morazan, Marti and Juarez; and in the South Bolivar, San Martin and O'Higgins, and we should remember which were the ideals and the purposes that inspired these men of our continent. They were the ones who gave us a free world; a world where we can live without pressures, and without apprehensions of any kind; where each one can exercise his profession, his activities and can create and produce without interference of any sort. They gave us a world where we enjoy ample freedom;

a freedom that only has as its boundary, public morality and that only ends where the rights of others begin.

With this clear mind and on those principles the motor and the creative impulse of those great men of our continent should be formed. Let us become one bloc; a united bloc, strong and firm and let it become a barricade to those extremist and extravagant currents that come to us from other continents trying to destroy our free lives which are full of opportunity for all. Right here in Colon only a few weeks ago those currents, taking advantage of the indignation of the students, tried to provoke chaos, pain, disaster in this city but thanks to quick and effective action by the authorities a disaster to this city and to the nation was avoided.

And it is justly so that on these historic dates for our countries we should strengthen our spirit, strengthen our soul, our heart and our mind so as to create one indestructible bloc against those currents and groups who are in the search for opportunities to assail against the very heart of the country; against our institutions, our families, our lives and against the peace and order that should reign in our country.

On a certain occasion, after these incidents, I said that I took the challenge of those groups and I reaffirm it here again. I am willing to fight on any level that they challenge us. I have shown great tolerance up to now; a tolerance that has even brought criticism from my friends, because they feel that I should not be so tolerant. Up to now I have wanted to gather reason and show my country that I am not what many thought of my performance as a ruler. Many thought that I would not permit public freedom but the opposite has been the case. I have gone to the limit in my effort to facilitate the exercise of freedom for all, but now I am ready to fight and fight to the end. From now on I will permit no hostile acts in the streets. I am ready to repress them and I am ready to go to the extreme with the students and the colleges themselves. If they wish to provoke the closing of the colleges I will close them at the first step they take to the streets.

The country is presently enjoying great prosperity, business is growing, the national economy is being revigorated, there are job opportunities for many, unemployment has decreased and there are great future perspectives for the nation. This is what is being felt throughout the nation and this is also what great foreign investors have felt who come from other places to enjoy these opportunities, this state of being, and this atmosphere of national prosperity. Under no conditions will I allow this to be altered or wasted.

The National Government has very encouraging programs for Colon. Ambassador Adair has just told us of a government loan with A.I.D., under the auspices of the Alliance for Progress, of three million balboas [1 balboa=$1.00 U.S. curr.—Trans.] signed recently by him and myself in one of the slum areas of the capital city for the construction of low cost housing. To these three million balboas, obtained through the Alliance for Progress, the National Government of its own accord will add a million and a half, that is to say that four and one-half million will be invested for low cost housing. I have already told Mr. Riba, the architect who is here present, that a good part of this money should be used for continuing the multifamily program in the City of Colon so that all of these slum houses, where a great part of the people live under inhuman conditions, will be done away with.

The Institute of Economic Development is making the final arrangements to place up for bidding its property lots in this city so that all those who are interested in acquiring them to construct their homes can do so at reasonable prices and on easy terms. This will create many job opportunities for the City of Colon because it is the construction industry that offers most opportunities for all since it is a very diversified industry in which many merchants, industrialists and labors participate.

The bridges for the Portobelo Highway are being made ready. Work is being done on them. I am concerned that these bridges be installed soon. I have talked personally to the contractor and I was assured that the structures are now being made in Panama and will shortly be transported to the rivers where they will be put in place.

As for the buildings that were destroyed by the painful events which have occurred recently in this city I should tell you that the National bank has almost been completely rebuilt and the building for the National Lottery will soon be opened for public bids. I personally have seen the initial plans for this building. It will be a beautiful edifice; worthy of this city.

As far as the other National Government buildings which were also destroyed are concerned, the arrangements are progressing and the credit necessary to continue their construction is being obtained. We are greatly interested in erasing that image of pain and disaster from the City of Colon.

On the 26th of this month the bids for the installation of the Electric Plant in the De Las Minas Bay, in this Province of Colon, will be unsealed. Besides providing work for many people the plant will produce great wealth for this province in terms of electric outflow and it will give the industrialists an opportunity to acquire current at a lower cost which will be convenient, and satisfactory for industry.

A few days ago, His Excellency, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, together with the Panamanian Negotiating Commission gave to the gentlemen who are negotiating for the United States in Washington the three instruments that Panama has proposed for the consideration by that mixed commission; a new Treaty on the Canal exclusively, a pact for bases to defend the canal and the bases for the possible construction of a new sea level canal. These instruments were fully dicussed and debated by our most authoritative public men in international law and in relations with the United States. They are all men of great probity, and of great patriotism; serious men, whom the country can never doubt. They form part of the Foreign Relations Commission and others are advisors to that Commission. I confide in the spirit of justice and equity of the North American Government and people and I also have confidence in the seriousness and patriotism of our own representatives in this grace and important mission. And Gentlemen, I ask the Almighty to illuminate the North Americans as well as the Panamanians so that the result of that round table discussion, where they are to negotiate on matters of transcendental and vital importance for both countries, will be instruments that will give us peace, equity, tranquillity and the harmony that should reign today and always between the United States and Panama.

And finally gentlemen, I am going to ask you to raise your glasses of champagne with me in a spontaneous, and very sincere and deeply felt toast to the North American people on the occasion of this grandiose day, to the Government of the United States and personally to President Lyndon B. Johnson and his distinguished family.

Secretariat of Presidential Information, Panama, July 4, 1966.

Translated by J. Richard Avena.

Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it has been stated that the U.S. Corps of Engineers has been contributing to a potential water pollution problem by disposing of waste materials in the waters of Lake Michigan at Chicago.

In view of this situation, the board of trustees of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago passed a resolution on July 12, 1966, petitioning the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to take immediate steps to cause the dumping of materials in Lake Michigan to be halted. The sanitary district resolution observed that the dumping is being done in areas beyond the jurisdiction of the district, the city of Chicago, and the State of Illinois.

In editorial comments on July 20, and July 24, 1966, Chicago's American discussed this situation and suggested a course of action to be followed to correct the problem. The American suggested that Congress provide funding for the Corps of Engineers to obtain an alternative dumping site.

I respectfully urge that all parties involved—the Corps of Engineers, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, and the appropriate Federal authorities—work expeditiously and cooperatively to arrive at a solution to this problem. The contamination of our Nation's lakes, rivers, and other tributaries is well known to all of us. The pollution of our Nation's waters must not be permitted to continue.

I introduce for the RECORD at this point a letter and the resolution of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago and the two editorials from Chicago's American:

THE METROPOLITAN SANITARY
DISTRICT OF GREATER CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., July 18, 1966.

Hon. DONALD RUMSFELD,
Glenview, Ill.

DEAR MR. RUMSFELD: On July 12, 1966, the Board of Trustees of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago resolved that the attached resolution be mailed to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and that a copy of this resolution be mailed to you.

Following in the footsteps of our wise forefathers, we have fought to keep all pollutants out of Lake Michigan, which has afforded Chicago the only uncontaminated metropolitan water front on all of the Great Lakes.

In view of the stringent anti-pollution standards we have enacted on those within our metropolitan area, we believe that the Corps of Engineers, as well as all other Federal Governmental agencies pursuant to President Johnson's mandate, must be enjoined from dumping dredgings and any other waste materials into Lake Michigan which threaten our beaches and our water supply, and other primary uses.

Your continued good will and support will be deeply appreciated.

Very truly yours,
Frank W. Chesrow, *President*.

Resolution

Whereas, Barge loads of soil containing contaminated and polluted waters, sand and gravel, municipal wastes and other materials, are presently being transported from the Chicago area waterways and dumped or discharged into Lake Michigan some 10 or 20 miles from the shores of the lake; and

Whereas, The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago has at all times been unalterably opposed to the dumping of dredgings or waste materials of any kind into the waters of Lake Michigan; and

Whereas, The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago participated in a conference in the matter of pollution of the interstate waters of the Grand Calumet River, Little Calumet River, Calumet River, Lake Michigan, Wolf Lake and their tributaries (Indiana-Illinois) conducted by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at McCormick Place beginning March 2, 1965; and

Whereas, President Frank W. Chesrow of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago was designated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as a conferee at said hearing, and participated throughout said proceedings and was a signator to the findings adopted at said hearing for the control and elimination of pollution at the South end of Lake Michigan and in the waters and the rivers hereinabove mentioned; and

Whereas, The conferees on water pollution control in the Calumet River area and at the South end of Lake Michigan, on January 4, 1966, did introduce a letter dated December 21, 1965, wherein the conferees unanimously agreed that there should be no dumping of dredge materials of any kind in Lake Michigan; and

Whereas, the area used for dumping of dredgings is beyond the jurisdiction of The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, the City of Chicago, and the State of Illinois, and thus, the dumping areas are solely within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago through its Board or Trustees, hereby petitions the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, acting under the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Public Law 660 as amended by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961 (PL 87-88), and by the Water Quality Act of 1965 (PL 89-234), to take immediate steps to cause the dumping of all dredgings and any other waste materials into Lake Michigan in areas beyond the jurisdiction of The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, the City of Chicago, and the State of Illinois, to be halted and terminated for all time; and be it further

Resolved, That the copies of this Resolution be transmitted forthwith to the honorable conferees on the matter of pollution of said waters viz. Mr. H. W. Poston, Mr. Blucher, A. Poole, Mr. Clarence W. Klassen, and Mr. Frank W. Chesrow; and to the Honorable Paul H. Douglas and the Honorable Everett M. Dirksen, U.S. Senators of Illinois, and to each and every Congressman of the Illinois delegation in the United States House of Representatives; to the Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Department of the Interior; to the Honorable James Quigley, Administrator of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration; to the Regional Office of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration headquartered in Chicago, to the Honorable Otto Kerner, Governor of Illinois; to the Honorable Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago; and to Brig. Gen. Roy T. Dodge, Division Engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; and be it further

Resolved, That this Resolution be spread of record and printed in the proceedings of this date.

Trustees, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago,
F. W. Chesrow, President, Vincent D. Garrity, MAW, Vice President, Francis P. Kane, Earl E. Stuyhorn, Valentine Janicki, John B. Brandt, Nicholas J. Melan, John E. Egan, Earl A. Deutsch.

Dated July 12, 1966.

[From the Chicago's American, July 20, 1966]

Confusion on Lake Dumping

The only thing quite clear about the dumping of dredged material into Lake Michigan is that several federal agencies just aren't getting thru to each other, even tho they do seem to talk. Thru the public health service and the federal water pollution administration, the federal government is conducting a vast and expensive program to save Lake Michigan from being ruined by pollution; meantime, the army corps of engineers is dumping into the lake tons of material, presumably polluted, brought up by dredges widening and deepening the Cal-Sag channel.

The sanitary district last week called on the engineers to stop the dumping, and approved an appeal for action by the water pollution administration if it weren't stopped. In reply, a spokesman for the army engineers said the dumping would be halted if other dumping sites on land are provided by the sanitary district or some other local governing body.

The basic problem seems to be not dirt but money. The engineers say it would cost millions to acquire dumping sites on shore, and they don't have it. Which compounds this federal puzzle of neither hand knowing what the other is doing. Congress has provided hefty funds for the fight against pollution; couldn't it provide enough to keep the work from being undone?

The engineers, moreover, say they have been talking for more than a year with the anti-pollution administration, but that no one has yet told the corps what it should do to meet pollution standards or to determine whether pollution is taking place.

To our mind, providing money for dumping grounds is a federal job, not a local one. The Cal-Sag channel project is not for the benefit of Chicago, which will get only a small part of it. The enlarged channel will enable big barge tows to meet with ocean shipping in the Lake Calumet harbor to transship cargo; this greatly expanded trade will increase profits and earnings thruout the midwest and beyond.

Congress should finance the project adequately. First, however, it would be nice for the various federal agencies involved to say hello to each other.

[From Chicago's Sunday American, July 24, 1966]

Price of a Clean Lake

In an editorial Wednesday, we called attention to a confused, self-defeating situation here in which one federal agency is methodically undoing the work of another. While the water pollution control administration is fighting to reduce the pollution of Lake Michigan, the army corps of engineers continues to dump into the lake—as it has been doing since 1924—material dredged up from the bottoms of harbors and rivers.

The situation is not the result of villainy or anyone's part. The engineers contend—not without reason—that spoil has to be dumped somewhere, that disposal sites cost money, and the they can't get an extra dime from Congress without justifying the expense by a cost-benefit formula. But a further element should now be added to this picture:

In an unincorporated area around 123d street and California avenue, near Blue Island, are two huge clay pits, 50 to 60 feet deep and with a total area of 174 acres. The pits are now being used for dumping garbage, to the distress of Blue Island residents; community officials and a local newspaper, the Blue Island Sun-Standard, have been waging a valiant campaign to get the pits filled with something less smelly and less dangerous to health.

These holes would make ideal dumping sites for the spoil that is now being dumped into Lake Michigan. What's blocking this logical solution from which everybody would benefit?

Once again, money—or more exactly, the question of who's going to pay it. The contract to fill the holes for the Illinois Brick company is held by the John Sexton company, which is now dumping the garbage. The engineers would have to reach an agreement with the Sexton firm, pay it to use the clay pits, pay the extra contracting costs involved in hauling spoil from the dredging sites, and get the money from Congress. To do that, the corps has to prove that benefits will result proportionate to the expense.

The engineers would prefer to have the metropolitan sanitary district foot the bill. They point out that it doesn't matter much to the taxpayer, since the money comes out of his pocket in either case. And the sanitary district provides the land along the Cal-Sag channel where spoil from that dredging projects is being dumped.

The essential point, however, is that this buck-passing has to stop somewhere. The longer it goes on the dirtier our lake gets. It is a federal body, not the santiary district, that is contributing to lake pollution, and it is logically up to the federal government to stop it. Congress is now, in effect, tearing down with one hand what it builds up with the other, and all the other absurdities in this situation flow from that basic one.

Reps. Edward Derwinski [R.] and Daniel Rostenkowski [D.] of Illinois are currently arranging meetings on the lake-dumping problem with representatives of the engineer corps and the sanitary district. We hope the district will take part and strongly urge its viewpoint—which we believe to be the right one—that Congress should provide money to do the whole job, not see it spoiled by economies in the wrong place.

Surely the funds needed for a dumping site can be found somewhere. If the engineers find it hard to justify the expense, we suggest they concentrate on the fundamental fact: With pollution of our water supply already far advanced, it costs more now to protect what's left. But clean water is worth the price.

Free Travel—Open Minds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Denver Post describes as encouraging the recent easing of restrictions on travel to Communist countries.

Americans will not be brainwashed by visiting such countries as Red China or Cuba, the newspaper declares. Rather, it is likely that they will be better informed and more thoughtful as a result of their observations.

Peking has refused to grant entry visas to Americans, the newspaper notes in an editorial, and there is no reason to expect an overnight change in policy. However, it states, we should not be in the position of blocking the way when the Chinese doors are opened.

The complete editorial follows:

Free Travel—Open Minds

The wisest policy the United States can have on travel restrictions, we believe, is to have as few restrictions as possible. The State Department's announcement of a new relaxation of travel rules for Communist countries is encouraging.

We do not fear Americans will be brainwashed by visiting such nations as Red China and Cuba. It is much more likely American travelers will be better-informed, more thoughtful—better Americans—as a result of their observations.

The department formerly allowed newspapermen, medical scientists, graduate scholars and public health specialists to have passports to visit five Communist countries "off limits" to normal travel. Now the list has been expanded to include persons "in cultural, athletic, commercial, educational, public affairs or other fields" who can show that their trips will benefit the United States. The secretary of state still retains discretion to determine whether a trip is in the national interest, and he ought to use his discretion rather liberally.

Several passports have been issued recently for travel to Red China—the latest going to G. William Miller, a Rhode Island industrialist interested in touring China as a private citizen.

So far the Peking regime has refused to grant entry visas to Americans, and there is no reason to think Peking's policy will change overnight. But the U.S. government should not be in the position of blocking the way when the Chinese doors are opened.

Jerome C. Koch, Sr., Dies at 70; Had Developed 61 Subdivisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES P. FARNSLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record an article from the Louisville Times of July 6, 1966, regarding the death of one of Louisville's most prominent and civic-minded residents, Mr. Jerome C. Koch, Sr. Mr. Koch was a fine gentleman and a good friend and will be greatly missed by the people of our community.

The article follows:

Jerome C. Koch, Sr., Dies at 70; Had Developed 61 Subdivisions

Jerome C. Koch, Sr., 70, president of the J. C. Koch Real Estate and Insurance Co. and an original member of the City-County Planning and Zoning Commission, died at 1:30 a.m. to day at his home, 1913 Crossgate Lane East.

He was a long-time Louisville developer and was the sales agent and development supervisor for the old Farnsley family property along Crums Lane in Shively.

With his sons, he developed 61 subdivisions, including Heatherfield on the old Farnsley property. He also constructed more than 700 single-family dwellings, plus numerous business developments.

A Democrat, he was appointed to the first planning and zoning commission in 1942 and served for two years. He was named to another four-year term on the commission in 1959, but resigned in 1961 because of ill health.

Koch was a member of the board of directors of Avery Building and Loan Association and was appraiser for the company for many years. He was also a member of the Louisville Real Estate Board, the Society of Residential Appraisers, the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the Louisville Board of Insurance Agents.

FIRST SHIVELY ROTARY HEAD

He was organizer and first president of the Shively Rotary Club, was a member of the Audubon Country Club and was a charter member of the 235 Club and the old Pastime Boat Club. He was a veteran of World War I and was a member of the American Legion.

Survivors are his widow, the former Pauline Hendry; two sons, Richard J. and Jerome C. Koch Jr.; a brother Chester Koch, Cleveland; two stepsons, William G. Hardy Jr. and George F. Hardy; and nine grandchildren.

The funeral will be at 10 a.m. Friday at St. Helen Catholic Church, 4005 Dixie Highway. Burial will be in Calvary Cemetery. The body will be at the W. G. Hardy Shively Chapel, 4101 Dixie Highway, after 5 p.m. Wednesday.

The family has asked that expressions of sympathy take the form of donations to the St. Joseph Orphans Society.

Congressman John E. Fogarty, National Dental Health Assembly, Emphasis: Fluoridation, Marriott Twin Bridges Motor Hotel, Arlington, Va., February 6, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

Congressman John E. Fogarty, National Dental Health Assembly, Emphasis: Fluoridation, Marriott Twin Bridges Motor Hotel, Arlington, Va., February 6, 1966

Let me begin the brief remarks I have prepared for tonight by saying what a real pleasure it is to be here with you, to be here with so many good friends. I am particularly pleased to share this platform with the distinguished Undersecretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Cohen, the Surgeon General, Dr. Stewart, the President of the American Dental Association, Dr. Hine, and our Chairman, Dr. Diefenbach.

I notice with great satisfaction that the participants of this Conference include representatives from virtually all segments of society. With the dental profession in the forefront, we also have gathered here distinguished leaders from government, from medicine, from education, from the scientific community in its broadest spectrum, from the law, from the theater, from news media and perhaps most importantly from the lay public.

This representative cross-section of America typifies a working democracy at its finest. It demonstrates the dynamic kind of partnership that can exist between a government and its people to reach an objective for the benefit of mankind. And mankind truly will be benefited if we are successful here in refocusing national attention on and gaining increased public acceptance of one of the most significant public health measures of all time—the controlled fluoridation of public water supplies which was launched on an organized basis just twenty years ago.

To many of us in this room who have seen the vast accumulation of unassailable evidence establishing the safety and efficacy of fluoridation, a lot of these years have been disheartening—frustrating. We have witnessed more times than we should the rejection of solid scientific findings by the use of propaganda, distortion and rumor. After surviving the critical and deep-searching judgment of their professional peers, the honest and dedicated scientists who discovered and proved fluoridation, too often have found themselves embroiled in and defeated in the arena of public opinion and politics. But while this is a disquieting and discouraging fact of life, these pioneers of whom I speak should take some solace from the fact that they are not alone among those in the course of history who have suffered similarly. The Pasteurs, the Listers and many others could be included in this company. And in this context and for what comfort it might be, I would give you a statement known as Russell's law which can be applied to fluoridation and goes something like this: "The amount of resistance to a new discovery is equal to the square of its importance."

Perhaps in the case at hand, we should modify Russell's law by saying that the "amount of *noise* in resistance to fluoridation is equal to the square root of its importance" since I personally am convinced that were it not for the noise and the big-scare, the vast majority of our people would wholeheartedly accept fluoridation for the beneficial health measure that it is.

Now, this three day meeting is billed as an assembly but it would be just as accurate—maybe more so—to think of it as a conversation, a conversation among a group of friends who share a long-standing commitment toward improving the health of our fellow citizens and who recognize that we must achieve this commitment primarily through a process of education and persuasion.

This certainly is not the easiest or quickest way of getting things done. It is frequently frustrating. It always requires great patience and the ability to take the long view. It would be much simpler, in the short run, to rely more on force than persuasion, more on sanctions against opposing points of view than on education leading to understanding and acceptance. These are especially tempting alternates when we know we are right, when every objective, scientific test that can be devised demonstrates how right we are and how wrong they are.

That we have come together for this three day conversation, however, is proof that we continue to take the long view, the wise view in my opinion; that we continue to put our faith in education and persuasion. It isn't, after all, as if we can't see any progress over the past twenty years. As of today, nearly 70 million people are benefiting from fluoridation. Just a week or so ago, Dallas refused to go along with the frightened people who urged that city to stop fluoridation: the victories of Detroit and New York are still fresh in our minds and eligible perhaps to be counted as indications of a trend. Though we are not doing as well as we might want to do in this education campaign, we aren't doing so badly either.

But, the prime purpose for our gathering here, I take it, is not to measure our progress so much in terms of raw statistics about victories and defeats as to analyze it in terms of accomplishing what is the most basic thing of all that a democracy does: capturing and concentrating the attention of community leaders and ultimately the community itself on one issue, to such a pitch that action flows inevitably, irresistibly, from this concentrated attention. This is not a difficult process to describe but it is a very difficult thing to do and there is never a time when you can say you are doing as well as you might wish.

Let me try to illustrate my point in this way. You know, everyone, when first elected to Congress, is like that character in Gilbert and Sullivan's the Mikado: He has a little list. He came to Congress with a list of bills he wants to propose, of laws he wants to pass. Sometimes—and you can take it from an expert—that list becomes a bit dog-eared and yellow with age before he can mark everything on it as having been accomplished.

At the beginning, there is a certain blindness about the items on the list. It is practically impossible for this new congressman to understand how anyone could seriously oppose any one of his proposals. While I don't go so far as to say that he expects suspension of the rules, and unanimous passage of everything he wants, if in fact it did happen that way, it wouldn't surprise him. But that is a dream world not a real one. In a real world, it is more like that story Mark Twain used to tell. When he was 15, he said, it seemed to him that his father was the most stupid man who had ever lived. When he was 20, he went on, he was amazed at how much the old man had learned in just five years.

I suppose this lesson Twain learned is what the sociologist would call interaction and that's what happens when we set out to accomplish things in the real world: we interact on each other, we learn to discard unsound concepts to see things in fresh perspective, to accept the precept that lasting progress can be made, things can be fully accomplished not only by whipping up sudden excitement but also by patient and persistent effort, by careful education.

Once in a while in the history of a nation it does happen that a number of long-supported projects come to fruition almost simultaneously, in a kind of chain reaction. When this rare event occurs, there is a sudden almost revolutionary leap forward that transforms the nation and enriches immeasurably our definition of what America is and what kind of opportunity it should hold out for its citizens.

Looking back, we can see now that this is what took place during the famous 100 days of Franklin Roosevelt's first administration. It is my personal conviction that future generations will look back at today and discern much the same thing. I think congressional historians especially will see that Congress during 1964 and 1965 was engaged in what can be honestly termed peaceful revolutionary activity with regard to health and welfare matters. During that time, we enacted and implemented the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, we enacted and implemented the Nurses Training Act, we moved ahead on health care for the aged, we vastly improved and expanded the health care available for the mentally ill, the handicapped, the disabled and others. We moved forward on a broad front in health research and initiated new programs in the fields of heart disease, cancer and stroke. We launched the War on Poverty with special attention given to health needs, particularly in Project Headstart the health needs of poor children. This is not, of course, a complete list at all but it is an indication of what I am talking about when I say this sustained congressional effort has been revolutionary in its effect on our country.

Now—you are much too sophisticated an audience for me to pretend, even if I wanted to, that all of these measures were thought up on a Monday, given hearings on a Tuesday and passed on a Wednesday.

When I first came to Congress more than two decades ago, I had in pocket one of those little lists I referred to earlier and prototypes of many of our new programs were on it. I have gone through a period when some of my colleagues thought I was plain crazy to urge such proposals. I have gone through another period when some of my colleagues thought I was a first class pain in the neck to persist in urging them. Lately, I have been in a kind of mixed blessing period where some of my colleagues suspect I am some kind of prophet. Now, I never thought I was crazy and I am almost as certain that I am not a prophet. What I am mostly, I suppose is a determined Irishman.

I came to Congress with a set of convictions about what I thought this country could—and should—be doing for the health and welfare of its citizens. After what I hope was not too long a period of time, I learned how Congress works toward getting things done, to what degree the normal process can be speeded and how to tell when you are at the point where haste becomes to make waste.

I'd like to spend a moment on this point—how Congress works—because I think it has some relevance to the purpose that has brought us here tonight. In the past few years, as you know, Congress has been on the receiving end of a good deal of advice; not all of it wanted, much of it unneeded. Running strongly through much of this advice, is a kind of theme, a tendency to talk about Congress—indeed about the entire federal government—as "they" in contrast to the peopel who are always "we." To draw such a dichotomy is at best unnecessary; at worst harmful.

Each two years, every member of the House of Representatives and a third of the Senate must go before their constituents to be rehired or fired. Every four years the President must go before the whole people to have his mandate extended or ended. These are facts not theory, and they symbolize the truth of the matter, which is that Congress is at least as much a part of the people as, say, the steel industry and has at least as intimate a feel for the people's aspirations as, say, has the television business.

I would suspect that this audience is not one that needs to be persuaded about these facts. I doubt that many of you are victims of that dread disease called the Birch syndrome, the main symptom of which is frothing at the mouth when the word Washington is mentioned. Making that assumption, let me go on to one further comment about Congress. If there does indeed exist an intimate connection between Congress and the people, then why does it sometimes take so long to accomplish the thing that we know, really know, and not just guess, ought to be done? Let me give you a two-part answer to that question. The first part is one sentence: We are a democracy. The second part of the answer is to be found in the Bible: "All things have their season and in their time all things pass under Heaven. A time to be born and a time to die . . . a time to destroy and a time to build . . . He hath made all things good in their own time . . ." Earlier, I mentioned something about learning at what point too much haste becomes waste. That, too, is part of the answer. I am not talking here about the mere taking of a vote. Taking a vote is only part of the process, not always the most important part. If one has succeeded in education and persuasion, then a vote is a confirmation of success rather than the achievement of it. In fluoridation, as in other public health measures, we have traditionally talked less about votes than about achieving understanding on the part of community leaders.

What I wish to say is that accepting, recognizing Congress as part of the people, and as knowledgeable about the people's wants does not mean that Congress always moves forward in great leaps. Most of the time, it moves cautiously, sounds out carefully a demand for action in order to discover whether it represents a strong consensus—and consensus remains a favorable word even if it has been somewhat overused lately—or whether it represents a demand from a small segment of the population with a tremendous lung capacity.

Consensus among whom? Does it mean that the entire public must always be involved from the beginning? I believe it is important to draw some sharp distinctions here. When I talk about seeking a consensus, I am certainly not saying that Congress is a follower. Clearly, Congress must lead. But Congress must lead first of all in preparing the ground through that process of education and persuasion to which I have already referred. It must, through its deliberations, reach and involve at least those leaders who enjoy the community's confidence and commit it to affirmative action. Ultimately, the entire community must be involved.

Granted that this is often a tortuous procedure. Granted that it rarely proceeds with the kind of dispatch that proponents of a measure would wish. Granted even that in proceeding somewhat cautiously we run the danger of being too late, a danger about which I have been particularly concerned throughout my legislative career. Granted all of these things, I remain convinced that the general method by which Congress proceeds is a wise method. Whatever its inherent merits, a law effecting substantial change in our mode of living that is not clearly understood as to its intent and purpose is not a wise law. It is not a wise law to make because it will not generate the ultimate support of a sufficient majority of our people. This is especially true in the health field, where we so often deal with matters that are particularly and peculiarly individual in import, when the ultimate success of a measure depends so heavily on the personal decision to accept the measure and actually help implement it.

Now, why all this talk about Congress? Not just because it is interesting, though I hope it has struck you as being so, I have brought all this up because this assembly is—in relation to the people—a kind of Congress. Any group united in a national purpose which they are urging on the people is a kind of Congress because over and beyond its duty of making laws, Congress has the function of focusing attention on an issue, airing alternate methods of reaching an agreed upon goal and, through education and persuasion, leading toward the best method of achieving that goal.

The American Dental Association, for example, is a kind of Congress in its relation to the people. And let me say here, as I have said often before, that few major health groups have consistently demonstrated so profound a grasp of the process of education and persuasion as does this national dental group. The Association has understood the necessity of persistence and patience, of working away on a project, and of returning to it time and time again until the end result was realized.

The amount of effort required to attain public support and acceptance should never be underestimated. We still do not have in this nation a full understanding of the value of public health measures. This was demonstrated once again last month when, on two successive Tuesdays, the CBS Television Network administered a national health test and learned that the average American could not register a passing grade on such a test. This national health test also demonstrates how important it remains to continue enlisting the community leadership to help us explain our campaign for fluoridation.

The effort that we are committed to on behalf of fluoridation, then, is part of a total effort to enrich and deepen understanding of all public health measures. In some ways, as all of you know, the campaign for fluoridation has been a microcosm of all public health efforts. In the 20 years that we have been urging fluoridation, we have been opposed by some who, through ignorance, were genuinely frightened of fluoridation. We have been opposed by others who for personal selfish reasons thought it expedient to be anti-fluoridationists. But for the most part, I believe, our forward progress has been limited not by people who were frightened or selfish but by well-meaning people who didn't understand what we are saying, who didn't grasp the nature and urgency of what we wanted to do. The reasons for this, the various forms it has taken, the ways in which success has been experienced or failure suffered will be analyzed during the next two days. I don't want to anticipate any of this.

Neither do I want to leave the impression that I am indicting the pro-fluoridation forces. I have already made it clear that this is not my purpose. No doubt, we haven't been perfect either in our strategy or our tactics; mostly, I suppose, because we are not perfect human beings. But what is important is that we have not become so disheartened as to be paralyzed. We have instead continued to chip away, to try new methods of reaching the community leaders and the community as a whole, to give of our time and energy to this goal.

I think that all of us, in the back of our minds, have two thoughts that we bring to this assembly. First that fluoridation is well worth the effort we have invested in it. And second, the conviction that we will ultimately make our point with sufficient clarity and force that every public water supply in the nation will become part of the fluoridation system.

I want you to know that these two thoughts are uppermost in my mind. I want you to know how pleased I am to be with so many friends tonight to talk about this vital topic. And, finally, I want you to know that I and many of my colleagues are anxious to support your effort for fluoridation whenever possible. Thank you for asking me to speak to you tonight and I hope you will have every success during these next two days and throughout the months ahead.

Ho Chi Minh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, Ho Chi Minh's latest broadcast on North Vietnam's view of the conflict with South Vietnam was as vicious as it was regrettable.

That this will be the general reaction among Americans is indicated by editorials already published by the Philadelphia Inquirer and Washington Evening Star.

The Inquirer asserts Ho's obstinate refusal to negotiate and his other declarations reflect a barbaric attitude. It calls him a dangerous fanatic willing to sacrifice his country and people for the sake of a bankrupt dogma and whatever face he may retain in Communist affairs.

The Star considers it tragic that Ho has declined President Johnson's appeal to turn the key of peace. One can only hope he will change his mind, the Star says.

I submit both editorials for the Record:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 18, 1966]

Ho's Answer

President Ho Chi Minh's tough weekend statement in Hanoi is similar to the line he has followed in the past. Essentially, what he is saying is that the war in Viet Nam will be a long one. And as for negotiations, he has affirmed that they will be rejected unless and until South Viet Nam, the United States and other key parties accept Communist terms in advance.

This is in keeping with Peking's thinking and pressures. Also, at least on the surface, it has the support of the Kremlin, which has rebuffed efforts by Indian Prime Minister Gandhi and British Prime Minister Wilson to bring about an immediate reconvening of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indochina. If reactivated, the conference, which is co-chairmanned by Britain and the Soviet Union, might well be able to promote progress toward a peace settlement. But as long as the Russians refuse to cooperate, the bleak prospect of protracted fighting—with the danger of more and more escalation ever present—will continue.

Ho's statement may be regarded as his answer, full of bravado, to these words addressed to him indirectly last week by President Johnson: "First, victory for your armies is impossible. . . . Second, the minute you realize that a military victory is out of the question, and turn from the use of force, you will find us ready to reciprocate. . . . We want an honorable peace. . . . In your hands is the key to that peace. You have only to turn it." It is tragic that Ho, with Peking's and Moscow's backing, has refused to turn it. One can only hope, for the sake of the long-suffering Vietnamese people, that he will change his mind before the country is reduced to ruin.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, July 18, 1966]

The Real "Fanatic" Is Ho

The broadcast by North Vietnam's President Ho Chi Minh on Sunday was as interesting for what it didn't say as what it did say. No mention was made of earlier threats to "try" American pilots and execute them as "war criminals." If the absence of such mention was a result of increasing world revulsion to such threats, then it was some slight gain.

But Ho's obstinate refusal even to discuss peace negotations, his announcement that reserve officers and rear-guard forces were being mobilized, and reiteration that North Vietnam will never "surrender" were all reflections of the attitude that U.S. Ambassador-at-Large Averill Harriman has rightly characterized as "barbaric."

The United States has never insisted—or even asked—that North Vietnam "surrender"; only that it cease sending troops and supplies to attack the legitimate Government of South Vietnam, that it foreswear support of the Vietcong bandits who make governing a calamitous burden in the south.

Now it should be apparent to everyone, friends and foes alike, that the one mainspring that keeps this undeclared war going—and escalating—is Ho Chi Minh himself. The probability that he acts as the Red Chinese tell him to act does not lessen his primary responsibility.

We should hope that at least the "doves" and draft-card-burning beatniks in this country would have their eyes opened by Ho's uncompromising, unreasonable declaration.

His reference to America's "fanatically" bombing fuel supplies near Hanoi and Haiphong is the classic illustration of how far off the mark a propaganda statement will go. There has been nothing fanatic about it; every step the United States has taken has been carefully weighed, deliberately suited to bare-minimum needs.

There may be fanatics on both sides in this war, as in all wars, but the most dangerous fanatic is an Indochinese Communist who will sacrifice his country, his people and their hopes for the future—any future—for the sake of his bankrupt dogma and whatever "face" he may still retain in Red-bloc affairs.

Hon. Edward A. "Dutch" Kliewer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a very outstanding gentleman, Mr. Edward A. "Dutch" Kliewer, died in Longview, Tex., recently. I include a splendid editorial and article which appeared in the Longview Journal July 13, 1966. To the sons of Mr. Kliewer I express my sincere sympathy. He truly was an A-1 gentleman and citizen.

The editorial and article follow:

He Hath Wrought Well

(By Carl L. Estes)

It could be said of Edward A. (Dutch) Kliewer that here was a man whose imagination and creative ability were undimmed or unmarred by the years.

A quiet, self-effacing and unassuming individual, he was not content to rest on his laurels, or, because of his advanced age, to cease his relentless efforts to dream up something that would be useful to industry and to his fellow-man. His motivation was his desire to accomplish something for which he felt there was a definite need. It is gratifying to know that he had tasted of the nectar of success on numerous occasions.

Dutch Kliewer long ago learned that success is but the reward for effort, and over a long span of years, he continued to work and to achieve.

What a fine testimonial it was to him that in his 80th year he had developed a splash guard for heavy trucks that received the approval of the Texas Department of Public Safety. This device was designed to confine tire spray and mist from wet paving to the underside of trucks, thus contributing to safety on the highways. While he did not live to see this equipment in wide usage, it is reasonable to believe that others will see to it that his dream will be transformed into reality.

Some of his other inventions, including a smog-reducing muffler and an oil seal, have been used by the heavy trucking industry many years. These products and others were designed after he had passed retirement age.

A native of Newton, Kans., Mr. Kliewer had lived in California before he came to Longview 33 years ago. The oil industry always had an attraction for him, and he served it in several different ways—as a cable tool driller, production man and machinist. He was well known and well liked by all strata of the oil fraternity.

Dutch Kliewer was a good man by any method of measurement or evaluation. He was devoted to his family, his church, his friends, his community and his work.

His reward was a long, active life of useful service. He would not have asked for more. When his time came, he was prepared.

This man's life can be best summarized in these time-honored words: He hath wrought well. There could be no finer epitaph than this for our departed friend.

E. A. Kliewer, Inventor, Dies

Edward A. (Dutch) Kliewer Sr., 80, Longview inventor and resident of the Sherman Apartments, died early Monday at his apartment.

Kliewer was an inventor who specialized in items for the heavy trucking industry. His latest invention was a splash guard for heavy trucks to confine tire spray and mist to the underside of the truck. The Texas Department of Public Safety had recently approved the item. Other inventions included a smog-reducing muffler and an oil seal.

Funeral services will be held at 2 p.m. Tuesday at the Welch Funeral Home. Burial will be in Memory Park Cemetery.

Kliewer was stricken at his apartment shortly after 4 a.m. Monday and telephoned his physician. While talking to the doctor he sank into unconsiousness and dropped the telephone. The physician rushed to the apartments, ordered an ambulance to take the stricken man to the hospital. It was then determined that immediate surgery was required. Consent of a son in Dallas was obtained for the surgery but Kliewer died on the way to the operating room.

He was born in Newton, Kans., had lived in California and had been a resident of the Longview area since 1933.

He had been a cable tool driller, a production man and an oil field machinist.

Kliewer was a member of the Woodland Christian Church.

Survivors include his s ons, Edward A. Kliewer Jr., of Dallas, an attorney, and Donald E. Kliewer, Houston, managing editor of World Oil; four grandchildren, Gene, James and Edward Kliewer III and Nancy Kliewer; two brothers, Harry Kliewer of Reedly, Calif., and Elmer C. Kliewer of Fresno Calif.; a sister-in-law, Mrs. William McPherson of Sweet Home, Ore. His wife died last year.

Separate and Unequal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the Congressional Record the attached editorial from the Sheboygan Press, Sheboygan, Wis., concerning the "separate and unequal" treatment received by some 3.3 million homes in America.

I believe this excellent expression of a very real injustice will be of interest to my colleagues.

Separate and Unequal

Congressman John Race has introduced legislation to correct what he calls "separate but unequal treatment" of several million United States citizens. Interested as we are in congressional economy, it is difficult to see how anyone could oppose this bill.

The Post Office Department refuses to extend door to door delivery of mail to new residential subdivisions because of a lack of specifically appropriated funds. These homes in these new subdivisions, of which there are 3.3 million, get curbside delivery although their neighbors' mail is brought to the house. To service the 3.3 million homes not now serviced would require about $43 million a year because of the extension of routes. This seems to work out at about a dollar a month per family.

The fact that there are Sheboygan homes receiving such separate but unequal treatment only serves to more vividly illustrate the inequity. It seems to us that any government service intended for all the people, paid for by all the people, should be spread evenly and fairly among all our citizenry. Inequity at the hand of the government is indefensible and should be corrected immediately. There should be no unequal citizens, no separate groups. Congressman Race's action is a positive, constructive step worthy of the support of all of us.

Congress Reform Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1966, the Los Angeles Times carried an excellent editorial relating to congressional reform. Inasmuch as the bypartisan Joint Committee on Congressional Reform presented recommendations to "overhaul the congressional machinery," I believe the contents of this fine editorial are especially meaningful. They represent the opinion and reaction of the press to the report as filed and is deserving of the attention of my colleagues.

Many of the Members of Congress, myself included, have felt the recommendations do not go far enough but feel that at long last our voices are being heard and the opportunity for action appears imminent. I am hopeful the leadership of both parties will place these recommendations high on the priority list for action in this session of the Congress. The country is deserving of a more responsive and responsible Congress.

Congress Reform Needed

For the first time in two decades, a major overhaul of congressional machinery is being pushed by a special Senate-House committee. The 100 or so proposals will be incorporated in a specific bill in the near future and action by both houses will be sought before adjournment.

Although the program is not as sweeping as the Reorganization Act of 1946, it has considerable merit—and will stir up considerable controversy.

Emphasizing that there can be no justification for secret hearings unless national security or matters reflecting on the character of witnesses or other persons is involved, the committee recommended that most congressional committee hearings be open to the public and the press.

To further improve functioning of the two houses and their committees it proposed:

Authorizing committee majorities to meet and report out bills if the chairman refuses to act.

Providing three assistants to minority party members on each committee.

Putting Congress on a five-day week, thus ending the Tuesday to Thursday Club type operation.

Creation of a House Committee on Standards and Conduct similar to the unit now functioning in the Senate.

Establishment of a joint committee to conduct continuing studies of organization and operation of Congress.

The committee recommended limiting the main body of the Congressional Record to verbatim reports of remarks made on the floor and material germane to legislation under discussion. That, apparently, would relegate to the appendix speeches prepared but not actually delivered on the floor.

In another section of its report, the committee called for strengthening the Lobbying Regulation Act to provide more stringent controls over persons attempting to influence the legislative process.

The committee sidestepped many of the areas which have been under heaviest fire from congressional critics. In all fairness, however, it should be noted that it was specifically barred from doing anything about such things as the seniority system.

Republican committeemen, even while signing the report, regretted its shortcomings. They pointed particularly to the failure to require disclosure of assets and income by members of Congress, the lack of curbs on lobbying by the executive branch of government and the absence of reform of political campaign financing.

Those are, indeed, serious omissions, yet it may be argued that inclusion of such subject matter might jeopardize passage of what is primarily housekeeping legislation. The desired improvement in campaign financing and disclosure practices, however, should most certainly be incorporated in the administration's pending election reform bill.

Power of a Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Deseret News of Salt Lake City recommends that more women follow the First Lady's example in acting for the beautification of our cities.

The newspaper tells its readers that the operator of a chain of food stores in the Washington area initiated an extensive beautification program at his establishments as the result of a suggestion by Mrs. Johnson.

Because of the old adage about never underestimating the power of a woman, the Deseret News calls on more women in more cities to see the possibilities for beautification and urge that something be done about it.

In full agreement that we never, indeed, should underestimate the power of a woman, I offer the newspaper's editorial for the Record.

Power of a Woman

If Lady Bird Johnson lived in Pittsburgh, Chicago, Seattle, Los Angeles, or even Salt Lake City, our beautification program would be moving much faster.

The First Lady's MO (method of operation) is very direct.

A few months ago she wrote a letter to the president of Giant Food Inc., which has 88 stores in Washington, suggesting that he ought to landscape and beautify his stores and parking lots in order that they "become an oasis of beauty for your communities and customers."

The company chief replied that "in the headlong and sometimes mindless rush into technological tomorrow, we have tended to become careless in our responsibility." He added that he had initiated an extensive beautification program as a result of Mrs. Johnson's suggestion.

Now if more women would follow Lady Bird's example in seeing possibilities for beautification, and in urging that something be done about it, well . . .

Never underestimate the power of a woman.

Are Jobs in Danger?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ben Maidenburg is famed for his hard-hitting editorials. The brilliant executive editor and publisher of the Akron Beacon Journal is respected for his fearlessness in attacking the problems that beset our Nation.

Ben Maidenburg speaks directly from his knowledgeable mind and never avoids a controversial subject. He is indeed a "let the chips fall where they may" type of editor. Under his direction, the Akron Beacon Journal has become one of the most esteemed newspapers in the Nation. It has a truly outstanding editorial staff.

I believe that my colleagues in the Congress will enjoy reading the thoughts of Mr. Maidenburg as he outlined them in the Akron Beacon Journal of July 24, 1966. They follow:

ARE JOBS IN DANGER?

(By Ben Maidenburg)

In the July 14 issue of "The Machinist" there is an editorial titled "Strike." "The Machinist" is the publication of the union which closed down five major airlines recently.

The editorial starts:

"As one by-product of the airline strike, we can expect some short-sighted bird brains to renew their clamor for restrictions on labor's right to strike.

"In their minds a strike is always the fault of the employes, never the fault of management."

There follows a discussion of various theories put forth to avoid strikes or force settlement by government intervention, and then the editorial winds up:

"In the long run, no system will work as well or provide fewer inconveniences than free collective bargaining with the right to strike. That is the American system.

"That is why union members respectfully ask everyone to put up with the inconveniences and the delays until we can get this strike settled.

"As this is written no one is trying harder to find a solution than International Association of Machinists members and their representatives. However it also takes two to make a peace."

So it takes "two to make a peace."

How many does to take to make a strike, in a work force of, say, 10,000?

And this question is the topic of my sermon today.

In the last several months there has been a rash of work stoppages in Northeastern Ohio plants.

While I am not certain about all the strikes or walkouts, I would venture a small wager that in every instance the contract between the company and union provided for solution of quarrels—other than in cases where a contract has expired and a new one is being written.

I am not talking about the latter.

I am talking, this morning, of the instances where the firing or disciplining of one man in a plant employing thousands, has led to an entire plant being closed down—regardless of the fact that the contract set forth exact means of settling the complaint, without work interruption.

Let us assume the worst:

The man in question was fired or suspended because the foreman came in that morning with a hard nose—the result perhaps of his wife burning the eggs and the toast.

Let us assume that in this state of mind he was 100 per cent wrong in firing the union member.

Still there are provisions in all standard contracts for handling this situation—without work stoppage.

But are these matters being handled in the manner that the contract specifies—the contract agreed to by both union and management? Seldom.

What typically happens is that one man is fired, seven others refuse to work—in compassion for the fired one.

These seven are suspended and boom the whole plant walks out, refusing to return until the suspensions are lifted!

There follows those holier-than-thou statements by the union leaders that "this is an unauthorized strike." And statements by the union chiefs that the people should go back to work until the problem is ironed out within the context of the negotiated contract.

Do the appeals work? Are they listened to?

Don't make me laugh.

In other words, while "it takes two to make a peace" it takes only one man to make a strike.

In my example above, I have used a foreman who discharged a man for no good reason. It happens.

On the other hand all of us know strikes have occurred time and again when a worker has really thrown a monkey wrench into the machinery, just to be ornery. When he is fired or suspended the plant has been closed down by a "sympathy" striek.

I am not even hinting that management's hands are always lily-white.

But if the owners of a factory closed down the whole shop because one worker bunged up some machinery, that management would be hanged from the highest lamp post in no time at all.

"Contracts" would be cited and "arbitration clauses" and other items.

This being a fact, then why do contracts suddenly become scraps of paper if a union member is suspended or fired for what management considers a valid reason?

Suddenly there is this ugly picture:

Signatures of international presidents and vice presidents and local presidents and others who affixed their signatures to the contracts become valueless. It is obvious that these men, essentially, have no more control of their members than the U.S. has over Ho Chi Minh.

The whole thing is getting to be ridiculous.

For a long time Akron and the area was known as an area of labor unrest.

When the Area Development Committee was organized to do something about getting new industry—and jobs—its members went to all points of the compass to "sell" the area.

I was on scores of these trips. Time after time, we found industries which really wanted to be located around here for purposes of distribution, etc., shunning Akron like it had a permanent plague.

It took the ADC much, much time and much, much selling to convince industry that the Akron area was a good place to be located.

Chrysler moved in; so did General Motors and many others.

For a long time they were happy. Now, I would say without much fear of contradiction, they aren't so happy.

It may be, one of these days, that industry will stop coming into the area.

The usual attrition will follow, and there will be jobless again at the Bureau of Unemployment Compensation windows; and at the relief offices.

And the men and women will cry out again—as they did before. They will cry out that they are being mistreated; that industry, management and government are unfair and all that.

They won't remember at all that their day-to-day strikes caused it.

It is a horrible part of human nature that if a plant is unionized, that plant is fair game for anything.

Let the plant be closed, and someone else is to blame, certainly not the people who bedeviled the plant with contract-breaking walkouts.

That recent business at the Ford plant, the recent stoppage at Goodyear. And the constant static at Seiberling in Barberton—what can be the only result?

In the case of all, the companies will seek to protect themselves, and this they have a perfect right to do.

Protect themselves against what? Are they asking for 15-hour days, peanut wages and things like that?

Of course not. They are only asking that the unions deliver the contracts they signed.

They are only asking that, if the International President and the other officers sign contracts in good faith then the workers, represented by the officers, also act in good faith. And that the nonsense of "This is a wildcat strike and please, lads, go back to work" be backed up with action instead of pious palaver.

If a management, I repeat, busts a contract there are all sorts of ways to bring the management to the bar of justice.

But if one man in a work-force of 10,000 decides to build a motor backwards and is fired, he can close down the whole 10,000.

And who can do anything about it? No one, obviously.

When the Seiberling plant in Barberton was on the verge of being shut down, many in the area—union, management and others went to work to keep it going.

But, having saved the jobs of 1,000 or more men and women, those of us who worked on the matter, night and day, are wondering now whether the work-force gives what is known as a good damn. There's hardly been a peaceful day out there.

The bitter thing about all this is that most of the union members are good, honest, hard-working.

But when union meetings are held, these stable people are off fishing. A group of problem children show up for the meetings and whammo! we're off and running again.

"We can't force the members to come to meetings," the union leaders bleed. Well, they'd better start doing something about it.

I'm not for any government controls; I am not against unions—but it does seem to me that when I sign a contract, I should abide by it.

When a company signs a contract it has to live by it. But when a union signs a contract, anyone of 100,000 can break it and not be chastised.

Let all this keep on, and Northeastern Ohio again will become an industrial wasteland. Then what will the gentlemen do?

I know one thing they won't do: Blame themselves.

Ask John Steinbeck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Deseret News of Salt Lake City suggests that anyone wondering whether the intellectuals who criticize U.S. policy in Vietnam are right should turn to John Steinbeck for an answer.

The newspaper refers, of course, to the widely printed reply of Mr. Steinbeck to a letter from the Soviet poet, Yevgeny Yevtushenko. Mr. Steinbeck pinned the onus for the Vietnam conflict where it belongs—on the Communists.

His words, the Deseret News says, have such a ring of truth about them that they cannot in good conscience be ignored by honest men.

In full agreement, I place this editorial in the Record:

Why Fight for Viets? Ask John Steinbeck

Wherever critics of U.S. policy on the war in Viet Nam are found there is almost invariably a disproportionately large representation from the intellectual community.

Whenever support for that policy is being voiced, however, writers, artists, educators, and the like usually are hard to find.

From this observation it isn't far to the notion that perhaps members of this educated elite are right in demanding that the U.S. give up on Viet Nam as a lost cause or even an unjust one. It wouldn't be the first time that a minority, however small, viewed a problem with greater clarity than all those arrayed against it. Is such the case in regard to the course America is following in Viet Nam?

Anyone who has ever entertained such doubts owes it to himself to ponder the letter written recently by John Steinbeck, the Nobel Prize-winning American novelist, in response to a poem by Soviet writer Yevgeny Yevtushenko calling for protests against U.S. actions in Viet Nam.

Steinbeck, who has a son serving as a U.S. soldier in Viet Nam, declared:

"You know well how I detest all war, but for this one I have a particular and personal hatred. I am against this Chinese-inspired war. I don't know a single American who is for it. But . . . you asked me to denounce half a war, our half. I appeal to you to join me in denouncing the whole war.

"Surely you don't believe that our 'pilots fly to bomb children,' that we send bombs and heavy equipment against innocent civilians? This is not East Berlin in 1953, Budapest in 1956, nor Tibet in 1959.

"You know as well as I do . . . that we are bombing oil storage, transport and the heavy and sophisticated weapons they carry to kill our sons. And where that oil and those weapons come from, you probably know better than I. . . .

"I hope you also know that if those weapons were not being sent, we would not be in Viet Nam at all. . . ."

These words, we submit, have such a ring of truth about them that they cannot in good conscience be ignored by honest men.

As Edmund Burke once said, "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." No doubt just about all the critics of U.S. policy in Viet Nam are good men, but more of them need to realize, as Mr. Steinbeck does, the consequences of inaction there.

Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND F. CLEVENGER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, among the most beautiful of the many natural attractions of northern Michigan are the Pictured Rocks, stretching in a 15-mile rainbow along the shores of Lake Superior. My bill to create the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore would preserve for the enjoyment of millions of Americans the unspoiled beauty of these ancient rock formations, framed by lush green forests and the blue expanse of the lake.

During a visit to the Upper Peninsula last summer, Chicago Tribune writer Ken Ferguson was stirred by the beauty of the rocks and excited by the wealth of scenic attractions in the Upper Peninsula. His enthusiastic description of the region, published in the July 3, 1966, Chicago Tribune, brought 500 mail inquiries in 4 days, according to the Alger County Chamber of Commerce, in the Pictured Rocks country. And 80 Chicago area residents stopped in the chamber office for more information after reading the Tribune article.

If one story can enthuse 500 vacationers in the Chicago area alone, I invite my colleagues to consider what the response would be throughout the country after designation of this site by Congress as a national park.

Following is Mr. Ferguson's article:

Michigan's Pictured Rocks: Hiawathaland—Upper Peninsula Storied Shores of Gitche Gumee

(By Ken Ferguson)

Munising, Mich.—This is one of America's great undiscovered [by the average tourist] scenic marvels and family vacationlands—the fabled "Pictured Rocks" and Hiawatha country, which, if Congress approves, is slated to become Pictured Rocks national lakeshore. And Chicago is only 386 miles from Pictured Rocks, said to be the "Shining Big-Sea-Water" and the "Shores of Gitche Gumee."

Longfellow told all about it in his poem "Hiawatha":

"By the shores of Gitchee Gumee,
By the Shining Big-Sea-Water
Stood the wigwam of Nokomis,
Daughter of the Moon, Nokomis.

At the door on summer evenings,
Sat the little Hiawatha
Heard the whispering of the pine trees,
Heard the lapping of the water
Sounds of music, words of wonder . . ."

Indian legendry suggests that Hiawatha lived here in Munising, a delightful little city [population 4,000] laced with misty waterfalls, fringed with towering pine and spruce on a Lake Superior harbor, jumping off place for daily Pictured Rocks boat cruises.

Closely ringed on three sides by forested hills that could be straight out of the Smoky Mountain foothills, Munising fronts on the northerly edge of vast Hiawatha national forest, a great green multi-thousand-acre belt of verdant pine, spruce, and cedar wilderness dotted with scores of clear blue lakes in which to tent and trailer camp, rent a luxury motel or furnished cottage, fish, cruise, hike, and swim.

Situated on a magnificent sweep of Lake Superior shore [Gitche Gumee], in the lee of historic old Grand Island, where John Jacob Astor established a trading post for Indian furs in 1832, Munising is located 122 miles west of Michigan's famous Sault Ste Marie locks, 119 miles from St. Ignace and the Mackinac bridge, 46 miles east of Marquette, and 386 miles from Chicago.

Munising is an amazing place for many reasons. With Lake Superior at its front door, there are nearly 300 inland lakes nearby. Often referred to as the "Waterfalls City," Munising offers Munising falls, a rare example of grotto formations and sandstone within the city limits. No more than a mile away are Alger and Wagner falls; a short distance away are Miner's, Au Train, Rock River, Scott, and Laughing Whitefish falls, along with Spray and Chapel falls, Tannery falls and Grand Sable falls.

A short drive eastward along the Lake Superior shore from Munising is another of the nation's natural wonders, the famous "Mountains of Sand" of Grand Marais, which are the Grand Sable dunes immortalized in "Hiawatha":

"On the shores of Gitche Gumee,
On the dunes of Nagow Wudjoo,
By the shining Big-Sea-Water
Stood the lodge of Pau-Puk-Keewis"

They rise to 1,020 feet at one point and stretch for 7 miles along Lake Superior. Semi-precious stones are found on the dunes. Agates are discovered along the beach.

Grand Marais is the only natural landlocked harbor on the United States side of Lake Superior—also the only harbor from Munising to Sault Ste Marie. Grand Marais village is a picturesque Cape Cod-type northland community with all the charm and serenity of an East Coast harbor town.

But it is Pictured Rocks that attracts most tourists to the Munising area. Pictured Rocks is a series of water-sculptured, highly colored rock formations, rising perpendicularly along the cliff wall from Lake Superior to heights of 300 feet, beginning 5 miles northeast of Munising and extending 15 miles eastward along the coast.

At least two poets of international prominence mentioned Pictured Rocks in their poems: John G. Whittier and Longfellow.

Imaginative viewers see all sorts of weird, wave-sculptured rock formations during their Pictured Rocks cruises . . . likenesses of chapels, pulpits, sailboats, Indian heads, houses, and other resemblances in the beautifully colored cliffs.

A Pictured Rocks boat cruise out of Munising aboard Capt. Everett Morrison's 85-passenger cruise ship, Tiger Lady II, for the 51-passenger ship Sea Queen II is one of the country's most unusual travel thrills. [Adults $3.50. Children under 12, $2.] The complete trip, more than 37 miles, takes 2½ to 3 hours. The boats cruise closely to the cliffs and slowly enough for superb color-pictures. Now thru Labor day there are five trips daily, 9 and 11 a.m., and 1, 3, and 5 p.m. Wear heavy woolens—carcoats, sweaters, and jackets—along with rubber-soled, low-heel shoes.

This is no mill pond you are venturing upon. Lake Superior is the largest body of fresh water in the world. At one spot, far out in the lake, it plunges to a depth of 1,300 feet. Forty degrees is the average water temperature. Winds have a clean sweep across 250 miles of open sea.

The cruise eastward along Pictured Rocks cliffs is a breath-taking experience. The entire sweep of shore is still a wild, wonderful wilderness, almost unchanged since the days of Radisson and the voyagers. Pastel-colored, rock—light tan, gray, green, darker brown, marble cakes the cliff-face.

On the ship goes, past storied Miner's Castle rock formation, into Painted coves, Colored caves, Caves of Bloody Chiefs, Lover's

Leap, Rainbow cave, Sail Rock, Indian Head, Gull Rookery, Portal, famous Battleship Rock, Indian Drum, Chapel Rock, and Flower Vase.

Rivers rush down to shore. Waterfalls cascade along the cliff-face. Great emerald forests ride the cliff crests.

Back in Munising you discover modern motels, cottage courts, and restaurants which feature famous Lake Superior lake trout dinners [Red Cedar restaurant on M-281]. There's another culinary specialty of Michigan's Upper Peninsula which tourists shouldn't miss—the popular hot "Pasties" [meat turnovers, a meal in itself] brought over by immigrant Cornishmen known as "Cousin Jacks." Pasties are available at Starlite motel in Munising.

This city has many excellent little motels, including Starlite motel, Vacationer's motel, Dunklee's Sunset motel [only motel on picturesque Munising bay, one mile from downtown], and Scotty's motel. Write Chamber of Commerce, Dept. C. T. Munising, Mich., for brochures, motel and furnished cottage listings, restaurants, or stop in when you reach town for detailed information on how to get to the many Munising area waterfalls. There is a Hiawatha national forest ranger's office in Munising for complete camping information and maps.

Vacationers discover many things to see and do around Munising after they've toured Pictured Rocks; visits to the beautiful waterfalls; tours of Munising's paper mill [division of Kimberly-Clark corporation]; drives out to Grand Marais and the famous dunes and harbor.

Nicest thing of all, however, is the invigorating summer spell of the great green northland itself; enchanting nights under the Northern Lights with a shimmering expanse of mirrored water in front of you—and the vast, sprawling Hiawatha national forest at your back.

"Thus departed Hiawatha,
Hiawatha the beloved,
In the glory of the sunset,
In the purple mists of evening."

Willie Hunter's March

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, Willie W. Hunter, 17 years old, arrived in Washington last night, completing his journey from Atlanta. Traveling alone, he walked over 75 miles of the way carrying an American flag to show his love of country, and support for our difficult and trying position in southeast Asia.

I attach a copy of an editorial in the July 25 issue of the Atlanta Journal, which well states appropriate sentiments:

WILLIE HUNTER'S MARCH

Willie Hunter, 17, an Atlanta Negro high school student, is walking down to Washington to demonstrate his support for U.S. involvement in Viet Nam.

He is carrying an American flag and a knap-sack and he hopes to cover about 75 miles a day.

"I'm tired of hearing about the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Congress of Racial Equality make statements opposing U.S. participation in Viet Nam," he says. "Our country has its faults, but it's one of the best in the world."

Wouldn't it be nice if people all along Willie Hunter's route of march would join up and walk with him at least a little way to show they approve of what he is doing?

But they probably won't. The old fashioned positive support of America and America's policies doesn't seem to attract many people these days.

But at least motorists who pass him along the road the next few days can give him a smile and a wave as they go by and they might even want to stop and offer him a ride.

Meanwhile, the people who live in Atlanta can be as proud of Willie Hunter as he is of his country.

A Time for Candor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 27, 1966]

A TIME FOR CANDOR

This summer's harvest of horror—murder, arson, looting in city after city, week after week—is prompting ever more insistent questioning. Why? Who is to blame? Strangely enough, the response of a good many people is that it is not the fault of the rioters but of the general society and, if you please, the Federal Government.

One editorialist was moved to express the sentiment in the following extremist fashion: "The (Federal) housing program is too small. The poverty program is too small. It is not the riots in the slums, but these lame and inadequate programs that are the real disgrace of the richest nation on earth."

We submit that attitudes of that sort are an unmerited rebuke to America and the millions whose hard work and hard thinking have made it the most abundant and just nation on earth. We are glad that President Johnson, at least, is not thus beguiled; while commiserating with the plight of slum-dwellers, he is forthright in his condemnation of riots that tear at the very fabric of the community. "Our country can abide civil protest . . . it cannot abide civil violence."

Let us look a little more closely at the catalog of charges against the "inadequacy" of Federal efforts.

Large-scale Federal housing aid for low-income families has been going on for many years at a cost of many billions in tax dollars. It has failed indeed, but its inadequacy is not in terms of cost but in terms of concept. The same applies to the bulk of the activities launched by the more recent antipoverty program.

The fundamental conceptual flaw is a sentimental view, reminiscent of Rousseau, of the nature of man. According to this interpretation, man is inherently good and perfectible and is held down only by the external forces of society. Put him in pleasant surroundings, or give him enough money, and all will be well.

The inescapable corollary is that the society rather than the individual is responsible for his behavior, however ambition-less, venal or criminal. The doctrine has been preached with so much vigor, and not only in connection with civil rights, in contemporary America that it is hardly surprising to find some of the listeners taking it literally.

Experience, to put it mildly, lends little credence to the romantic view of man's nature; left entirely to our own devices, relatively few of us would qualify for sainthood. In that context, the political triumph of the American design of 200 years ago is that it engineered a maximum of personal liberty with a minimum of governmental compulsion. But the order is there, and it has to be, else the design falls.

Confronted with such self-evident facts, the civil rights leaders tend to retort with the argument that if they did not promote civil disobedience, nothing would be done to improve the squalid surroundings in which many Negroes live. Anyone contemplating civil disobedience, however, in a society whose existence depends on respect for law is obligated to ask himself what alternatives exist before he turns to that last resort.

Here again, the President put it well: "The ballot box, the neighborhood communities, the political and civil rights organizations—are the means by which Americans express their resentment against intolerable conditions. They are designed to reform society, not to rip it apart."

And the truth is that many individual Negroes, even before the past decade's civil rights legislation, have come up from poverty and gotten out of the "ghetto." (The term, incidentally, is a loaded one; by connotation if not denotation it suggests the falsehood that some governmental authority is compelling Negroes to stay in segregated, walled-in areas.)

Many more can be expected to make a decent living for themselves without the leaders having to rip up society. What cannot be stressed too often, and what the romanticists fail to understand, is that for the most part they will have to do it on their own; the leaders would be better occupied helping them help themselves than in creating the climate for riots. Even then, there will be some members of any society, regardless of color, who for one reason or another will not be able to make a go of life.

It's time, we think, for a little bit of common sense and candor. Neither the society at large nor the Federal Government is responsible for the violence. Those responsible are the rioters and the teachers of casual disregard for law and order.

L.B.J.'s Crunch With Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to learn of the off-the-record meetings held at the White House because sooner or later what happens in these off-the-record meetings comes to light as evidenced by the article "L.B.J.'s Crunch With Congress" by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak. Their column, which appeared in the Washington Post on July 27, follows:

L.B.J.'s CRUNCH WITH CONGRESS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

When the congressional leaders left the White House July 18 after hearing the President scold them for spending too much, the prevailing mood among the Democrats was disgruntlement bordering on anger.

One Democratic leader berated Mr. Johnson all the way back to Capitol Hill in the limousine he shared with several other leaders. Doesn't the President know, he complained, that with all this economy talk he is practically inviting Congress to emasculate his whole program?

He wasn't alone. In the Democratic cloakrooms this is the prevailing reaction to Mr. Johnson' low-key appeal that Congress vote in full the money he has asked—coupled with his loud refusal to permit one dollar to be voted for any other programs. By pounding on the economy theme, Mr. Johnson is putting squarely on the backs of liberals in his own party the onus for big spending; and big spending, he says, will mean higher taxes or big deficits.

What galls these liberals, many of them first-termers elected in the anti-Goldwater landslide, is that the President himself is not facing the voters in the November election, but they are.

Presidential silence on the Senate cut of $250 million in his foreign aid bill two days later further confused the liberals. It indicated Mr. Johnson may even be ready to backtrack on some parts of his own program.

That cut was sponsored by the Republican leader, Everett Dirksen of Illinois, and in the absence of a single protest from the White House, it got the support of no fewer than 64 Senators—two-thirds of the Senate.

Likewise, the antipoverty bill, already in a highly weakened state, is almost certain to feel the impact of the President's alarming talk about the budget. The same is true of Federal aid to education, of the highly-touted Johnson program to eliminate pollution from streams and rivers, and of other Great Society programs.

And yet, paradoxically, Mr. Johnson made it crystal clear in a White House session with the congressional money men last week that he did not want any congressional tampering with the Great Society. His exchange with Rep. John Flynt, a conservative Democrat from Georgia, symbolized his refusal to conceed to Congress any legislative initiatives. Flynt was one of a score of chairmen and ranking Republican members of House Appropriations subcommittees, the panels which start the money bills rolling through Congress, summoned to the White House July 19 for a tough presidential lecture on the budget. He complained to the President that every time an item was reduced in the House he got an angry phone call from the White House.

Asked to give an example, Flynt singled out the rent supplement bill. This program, designed to help low-income families get better housing, was severely trimmed in the House and for his part in the trimming, Flynt was scolded by the White House.

When Flynt finished his recital, Mr. Johnson assumed a pained expression. "John, that's different. Rent supplements is my program."

Irritated by the President putting the whole spending blame on Congress, the conservative Republican, Elford Cederberg of Michigan, then taunted the President by inviting him to veto bills that are not part of his program, such as the 2.9 per cent pay raise for Government employees.

Mr. Johnson demurred. It's not that simple, he said. Besides, he wanted to cooperate, not compete, with Congress.

Cederberg shot back: "We'll promise to cooperate, Mr. President, with the first veto you send up."

The reason for the President's crunch with Congress is, of course, the growing cost of the war in Vietnam, now estimated at close to $2 billion every month. But one likely casualty of Mr. Johnson's highly-publicized economy campaign may very well be his own Great Society program. Another may be the freshmen Democrats, who will now get the blame back home for their voting records in support of high spending.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in earlier remarks, there was a great nationwide surge of interest in Captive Nations Week this year. I am pleased to call the attention of the Members to proclamations issued by the mayors of Forest Park, Flossmore, and Tinley Park, Ill., in the congressional district I am privileged to represent. In addition, an editorial in the July 15 edition of the New World, publication of the archdiocese of Chicago, on Captive Nations Week, came to my attention, and I insert it in the Record as part of my remarks.

Captive Nations Week Proclamation

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Bernard G. Cunningham, Village President (Mayor) of Park Forest, Illinois 60466, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Park Forest, Illinois, and call upon the citizens of Park Forest to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness thereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Village of Park Forest to be affixed this 17th day of July, 1966.

B. G. Cunningham,
Village President.

Captive Nations Week Proclamation

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, W. Robert Riggs (Mayor) of Village of Flossmoor, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in village, and call upon the citizens of Flossmoor to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Proclamation

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Kenneth J. Fulton, Mayor of the Village of Tinley Park, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as "Captive Nations Week" in Tinley Park and call upon the citizens of Tinley Park to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Dated this 16th day of July, 1966.

Kenneth J. Fulton,
Mayor of the Village of Tinley Park.

Captive Nations Deserve Our Wholehearted Support

Speaking of Freedom Rallies, I can think of none more deserving of support than that planned for Captive Nations Day, Saturday, July 16. There is no doubt that the general public here in the United States has become very short of memory or, worse still, apathetic to the past and present sufferings of those who have been enslaved by Communism. On Saturday, 20 national groups, representing enslaved nations behind the Iron, Bamboo and Sugar curtains, are taking part in a parade starting at noon at Wacker Drive and State Street. Many of these people are refugees from the 20 nations represented. They would not be in this country unless they loved our nation and the freedoms we have here, and unless they looked to our nation as the last freedom-loving people who would be willing to help them help their homelands to restore freedom.

The list of captive nations reads almost like a litany—Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Lithuania, East Berlin, North Korea, North Vietnam, Cuba, to mention only a few. The source of captivity can clearly be pin-pointed in Soviet Russia and Red China. As long as these nations continue their imperialistic programs of infiltration, insidious revolution and ultimate world domination, none of us can hope for any true freedom.

Our Nation is not getting much self-deserved support from our traditional allies in working toward this goal. We are being subjected to heavy criticism, often hypocritical, from our enemies and even from those whom we would call our friends. Many voices have been raised within our own nation to criticize the support that we have been giving to the relatively small nation of Vietnam. Today (Wednesday) is called the "Day of Shame" in Vietnam. It is the day on which that nation was divided at the Geneva Conference in 1954—the northern half being turned over to Communist rule and the southern half remaining as a free nation.

Those among us who would prefer not to consider the situation should know more about some of the peoples involved. The puppet governments in Poland and Cuba have never ceased their oppressive harrassment of their own people who want freedom. Red China has liquidated hundreds of thousands of its own citizens for the same reason. The goal of the Communists is quite clear. If we fail to secure true peace and freedom in Vietnam, we will be giving up just one more frontier of freedom.

Thailand, Laos, Cambodia—you name the place—it's been on the list for Soviet aggression for years. If we don't stop it soon, there will be no free area left beyond our own shores, and big and strong and resourceful as we may be as a nation, we may not be quite big enough to undo the damage that has made millions of people captives and has tortured and murdered millions more.

Captive Nations Day should be heralded and supported by all Chicagoans. Most of us, or our parents and grandparents, come from such nations. The less fortunate are still captive. Let's keep them in our prayers and pledge them our constant support. If we don't we don't deserve the freedom we enjoy.

J. M. KELLY.

District of Columbia Problems Cause Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Carl Shipley, Republican chairman in the District of Columbia, recently addressed the District Junior Chamber of Commerce about matters concerning him in our Nation's Capital. I request inclusion of his speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SPEECH OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOP CHAIRMAN CARL SHIPLEY, TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, JULY 7, 1966

One of the most conspicuous failures of the Great Society is the constant deterioration of the Nation's Capital. Today the population of the 69 square miles which make up the District of Columbia is about 805,000 persons, roughly the same as it was 16 years ago in 1950. Municipal services are no better, and probably worse today than 16 years ago.

A main feature of the Great Society is its "creative federalism"—the Federal Government by-passing State Governments to solve local problems directly with Federal help and management at the local level. The District of Columbia is the one place in the United States where Congress has exclusive legislative authority, and where the President has absolute control by reason of the fact that he appoints, subject to the confirmation by the Senate, the two civilians and one military officer who make up the three-member Board of Commissioners, which governs the Nation's Capital. There are no elected local officials and no local lawmakers—the President and the Congress cannot escape their ultimate and absolute responsibility for conditions in the Nation's Capital.

If the Great Society's "creative federalism" is a sound theory of Government, Washington, D.C. ought to be a shining example of urban life at its best. If the Federal Government can better solve municipal and urban problems than State and local Governments, Washington, D.C. should be a model of perfection. But what are the facts?

District Building employees have increased from 24,000 in 1960 to about 33,000 in 1966. Many are in "leaf raking" or make-work jobs—unnecessary for efficient Government.

Crime and juvenile delinquency have increased steadly until Washington justifies a description made by a United States Senator on the Floor of the Senate to the effect that it is the most dangerous city in the United States after dark.

More children "drop out" of High School than graduate every year. Unemployment continues at a high level among the unskilled, there is a serious housing shortage, and the flight to the suburbs of the white population and taxpaying, job-generating businesses continues to accelerate.

A recent report to Congress by the Comptroller-General of the United States showed 611 District Government employees identified as having licenses to drive taxicabs, of whom 222 were found to have been out driving their cabs while drawing pay, on official time as municipal employees. This double worklife is contrary to the public interest, which assumes a 40 hour work week. The health of these employees must suffer, and certainly the D. C. tax-payer does not get full value from a city employee who drives himself to exhaustion in a cab.

Is it any wonder that new businesses refuse to locate in the District or that new families coming into the area settle in Maryland or Virginia suburbs? Is it surprising that old taxpaying businesses leave for the suburbs, and old taxpaying families depart for refuge across the District line?

If it were a question of money, inadequate budget, or lack of revenue, there might be some justification for this sad state of affairs.

However, the melancholy fact of the matter is that District residents today have a budget of $428 million to maintain the municipal government to serve our local population, as against a budget of $241 million in 1960 to serve the very same size population. Today we have one of the highest ratio of municipal employees to the population served in the United States, and yet it is one of the most floundering, bungling, and confused municipal Governments to be found anywhere. District residents have endured 15 tax increases in the last 10 years, ranging from personal income to real estate, and the Great Society leaders have proposed 9 more tax increases now pending in Congress.

District of Columbia residents in 1959 paid a total revenue in local taxes of $138 million. If the pending proposals become law, the same residents will be paying $240 million in local taxes next year. For a typical middle-class family of four in the Nation's Capital this means an estimated burden of major taxes of $521 per year, as against, for example, $308 in Dallas, Texas, $347 in San Antonio, and $350 in Houston, Texas, which are comparable major cities.

The Great Society administrators still have a chance to save the Nation's Capital by using tax and fiscal policies to stimulate an inflow of new taxpaying and job-providing businesses, and to encourage an inflow of new white taxpaying families moving into the area. This same authority can be used to open up equal opportunity for housings, jobs, and schools in the Maryland and Virginia suburbs for a nearly 65% Negro population, many of whom would like an opportunity to enjoy suburban life.

The President and the Board of Commissioners have adequate statutory authority and administrative authority to bring about a redistribution of the Negro families who are now concentrated in the District on a more even-spread basis throughout the Maryland and Virginia suburbs.

In addition, the leaders of the Great Society should propose to Congress a 1% withholding tax at the source on the personal incomes of the approximately 222,000 commuters who work in Washington by day, but return to live, vote, and pay taxes in Virginia and Maryland after the sun goes down. Over 44% of all the 505,000 persons with jobs in the District of Columbia reside in Maryland or Virginia (19% in Virginia, 25% in Maryland). Other cities, including New York, are finding this source of tax revenue a means to distribute throughout a metropolitan area an equitable share of the cost of municipal Government among those who derive direct benefits from the services provided out of tax revenues.

These two major steps could change the *Great Society's most conspicuous failure* into one of its outstanding successes—A Nation's Capital of which all of America's citizens can be proud instead of a Nation's Capital which at the present time can only be a source of shame.

Sixty Arizonans, Including Joseph Wood Krutch and the Director of the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum, Appeal for Preservation of the Grand Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, recently 60 Arizonans—mostly professional, business, and university people—expressed their opposition to the Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dams in the Grand Canyon in identical letters sent to President Johnson and other officials.

Among the signers of the letters were Joseph Wood Krutch, William H. Woodin, who is director of the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum, and Philip Burnham, an editor of Commonweal magazine.

The eloquent appeal of these Arizonans speaks for itself. I include it hereafter:

TUCSON, ARIZ., *July 1, 1966.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
The Honorable MORRIS UDALL,
The Honorable PAUL FANNIN,
The Honorable CARL HAYDEN,
The Honorable JOHN J. RHODES,
The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
The Senate Committee on the Interior,
Mrs. LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

We residents of Arizona, dismayed and saddened at the prospect of the erection of two dams within the Grand Canyon, feel compelled to tell you of our strong opposition to this unbelievable encroachment upon what is the common heritage of all Americans and of the world.

We who sign this letter live and work in Arizona and are therefore vitally concerned with the well-being of this State and of its citizens. If the Colorado River is indeed the only practical source of the additional water our growing state needs, let us have the necessary diversionary installations without the dams at Marble Gorge and Lower Granite Gorge.

All of the points for and against the dams have been eloquently made, and we shall not repeat them. We simply want the President, the Secretary of the Interior, and the members of Congress to know that responsible citizens of Arizona are far from being unanimously in favor of the legislation sponsored by our congressional delegation in its present form. We remain convinced after arduous study of both sides, that vast areas of the Grand Canyon and adjoining regions will be effectively and permanently modified or destroyed if one or both of the dams are built. We further believe that, if the nation's greatest natural gift cannot be protected, we shall see the same arguments of expediency and dollar-practicality used to harm or destroy other wilderness areas of the nation. The people of the world watch us, and future generations will judge us, to see whether the world's richest nation will destroy its most valuable natural possession for gross utilitarian motives.

A nation which devotes itself principally to material progress and neglects man's primeval spiritual bonds with nature must inevitably become less human. New sources of water and power can be found, but once we have lost the Grand Canyon, or any part of it, we shall have lost it forever.

Gentlemen, we Arizonans plead with you: Don't build the dams at Marble Gorge and Lower Granite Gorge.

The Reverend John C. Fowler; Allan Carter, M.D.; Remo DiCenso, M.D.; Robert J. Oliver, M.D.; Juan E. Fonseca, M.D.; J. H. McEvers, M.D.; H. Allan Collier, M.D.; H. E. Pollock, M.D.; Raymond F. Bock, M.D.; John T. Spriggs, M.D.;

C. W. Pullen, M.D.; Neil Clements, M.D.; Robert D. Rawson, M.D.; Thomas M. Foreman, M.D.; George W. Nash, M.D.; Hubert R. Estes, M.D.; M. David Ben-Asher, M.D.; Urban S. Atterbury, M.S.; A. W. Gaudielle, M.D.; R. V. Highsmith, Rg. Phcy.;

Richard L. Lenz, A.C.S.W.; Stephen M. Weiss, Ph. D.; Lewis Hertz, Ph. D.; Louise Bronsen, Ph. D.; Dennis Greene, M.A.; Peter Horwath, Ph. D.; Frederick J. Schmitz, Ph. D.; Jean Robert Beck, Ph. D.; Dorothy S. Lieurance, (Mrs. W. F.); Joseph Wood Krutch; W. H. Woodin III, Director of the Ariz.-Sonora Desert Museum; Richard P. Knight; The Reverend Francis E. Williams D. Phil. (Oxon); James H. Freudenthal; Margaret E. Freudenthal; Robert E. Nabours, Ph. D.; James J. Jones, M.S.; Stephen B. Smith; Frank Patania; Eugene H. Bruce, M.A.;

Betty S. Gegenheimer; W. Edward Morgan; William Wilde, A.I.A.; Eve K. Morgan; Betty Chambers, R.N., M.A.; Guy K. Chambers, M.S.; Charles Coston, Ph. D.; Joan Coston; Thomas Harlan, M.A.;

Annita Harlan; Jean F. Goetinck; M.A.; Glenys Goetinck, Ph. D.; Paul S. Martin, Ph. D.; Mr. and Mrs. John L. Carlson; Mr. and Mrs. Ol J. Becker; John H. Hessel, M.S.; Mary Ellen Hessel; James E. McDonald, Ph. D.; Drummond Hadley, M.A.; Philip Burnham;

Carol G. Weiss, M.S.; Evis Schocket, M.S.; Seymour Rosenbaum, M.D.; Robert I. Cutts, M.D.; Roland D. Tharp, Ph. D.; Ted DeGrazia; Edward Tappan; Russel Ewing; Nora Loerpabel.

WNEW's Public Service Program, "The Invisible People"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity of hearing a program entitled "The Invisible People," on radio station WNEW in New York City, as a part of their award-winning series known as "Sunday Evening Closeup."

This distinguished series of programs has been a public service of radio station WNEW for some 5 years in the New York metropolitan area.

The program, under the title "The Invisible People," might very well have borne a subtitle of "The Sound of Poverty."

It deals with the situation of people who, through no fault of their own, are brought down from the normal income level to one of bare subsistence.

This particular program was written and produced by Mike Stein, and based upon the book, "Faces of Poverty," by Pastor Arthur Simon. The executive producer was Jack Pluntze, and Howard Epstein was in charge of technical supervision.

News Closeup is a public affairs presentation of WNEW and WNEW–FM, Metromedia stations in New York.

The program begins with Announcer Alan Walden stating as follows:

To most New Yorkers, the sound of poverty is the sound of several hundred demonstrators on a street . . . shouting slogans and demanding more money from the government . . . or the sound of angry poverty officials quarrelling over money for this project or that . . .

You won't hear any of those sounds tonight.

You *will* hear from the invisible people . . . from Mr. and Mrs. Carl Miller.

They're real people.

They live right next door to you . . . but you don't know it.

You may have passed them on the street today . . . but you didn't recognize them.

The Millers look just like you . . . but they're not just like you.

You've made it in this world. They haven't. And the question is . . . why. They aren't shiftless, they aren't dishonest. They aren't immoral. They don't bear the stigma of color. They don't want to freeload on the public. They want to work. Yet they were drawn into poverty much like a drowning man is drawn into the vortex of a whirlpool.

It concludes with the statement:

More than we care to admit, ours is a society in which the fit survive. And our notion of fitness is often irrational and morally deficient. Mr. Miller wanted to work. Yet, there were few jobs open to him. There was training he could have received, but did not. Poor health and lack of skills sucked him to the bottom. And now, the spectre of second generation poverty haunts the Miller children. At best, we open only a few jobs to him. . . . jobs that keep his family on the brink of disaster. And if they topple, we pay him to be useless, and heap upon his family an indignity which few of us would be able to bear.

This is Alan Walden. Have a thoughtful evening.

In between we have the development in good dramatic fashion, of the type of poverty situation that may at any time face any one of us. All poverty stricken people are not members of minority groups or residents of Appalachia.

I commend this series and this particular program and the radio station which presented it.

Homestretch for the Avenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of Joint Resolution 1030 for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue as a national historic site, I was pleased to note in the Washington Star on Sunday, July 24, an editorial supporting the resolution. The Washington Post had previously published an editorial endorsing the resolution. It is very gratifying that two major papers in the District share the same view.

I submit for my colleagues a copy of the Star editorial:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 24, 1966]

HOMESTRETCH FOR THE AVENUE

Legislation to give the present temporary Pennsylvania Avenue Commission firm congressional status for a period of five years is well past the halfway post on the road to final enactment. It has been approved by the Senate and by the House Interior Committee and awaits only action by the full House.

As a temporary presidentially-appointed body the commission has performed admirably in focusing public attention on the need to preserve and enhance our world-famous

Avenue of Presidents. The latest version of its plan, while by no means final, is imaginative and challenging. Taken in conjunction with complementary plans to revitalize the Mall and Potomac Park, it forms a vital part of an emerging master plan for the all-important heartland of the national capital.

But as long as the commission remains an advisory group only, its powers to implement its plan and negotiate agreements with private property owners are limited. And, although it has received an extraordinary degree of support from both government and private developers, it has gone as far as could possibly be expected without specific legislative sanction. The bill now awaiting final passage would accomplish this, and, what is more important, involve Congress directly in the development of a final framework for the future development of the Avenue.

The bill is believed to have majority support in the House and should pass without difficulty. However, in an election year and with Congress heading into the homestretch with major legislation still on the agenda, there is always the chance that it might be lost in the adjournment shuffle. Under no circumstances should this happen.

Auto Safety Legislation a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times—like many other newspapers and many millions of citizens—is heartened by the fact that Congress now appears certain to enact a program aimed at reducing slaughter on the highways.

In particular, the Times supports broadening of the measure passed by the Senate in order to cover used cars. The used car provision in the House version of the bill would not become operative until 2 years after the legislation takes effect, the Times notes. This, it says, would allow time for all the States to establish procedures for enforcement of Federal standards.

Calling action on the auto safety problem long overdue, the newspaper urges speedy approval of the broadened measure.

In the interest of the same objective, I place the Times editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, July 15, 1966]

AUTO SAFETY LEGISLATION A MUST

Since the turn of the century more than 1.5 million persons have lost their lives in traffic accidents. In 1965 alone there were 49,000 fatalities, 1.8 million disabling injuries and a like number of minor injuries in traffic accidents. The aggregate cost for the year in property damage, medical expenses, lost wages and insurance has been estimated at $8.5 billion.

As 10 million cars a year are added to the traffic stream such sorry statistics are bound to mount.

It is heartening, therefore, that Congress now appears certain to enact a program aimed at reducing slaughter on the highways.

The Senate has already passed without opposition bills providing for safety standards for new vehicles, federal grants for state and local highway safety programs and expansion of federal and state research on the problem.

It had been expected that the House would approve a less stringent program. The House Commerce Committee, however, has agreed to broaden the program to cover used cars—which account for as much as 90% of the traffic on our highways.

Under the House proposal, safety standards applied to all cars, including trucks and buses, manufactured after Jan. 1, 1968 would be subject to check when such vehicles were resold.

The practical effect would be that the standards would not apply to cars now on the road. That may be a regrettable gap, but proponents make the point that imposition of requirements retroactively would lead to impossible administrative problems.

Actually, California has already embarked on a safety program of its own. Any car, regardless of vintage, stopped on the road in this state for a Vehicle Code violation is subject to a safety check.

The used car provision in the committee version of the bill would not become operative until two years after the bill takes effect. That would allow time for all the states—less than a score of which now have inspection programs—to establish procedures for enforcement of federal standards.

Action on the problem is long overdue. The broadened measure deserves speedy approval by both the House and the Senate.

A New Weapon in the War Against Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to report on the growth of the new soybean crop in Alabama. The Department of Agriculture's latest acreage intentions report indicates a new record for Alabama in soybeans—206,000 acres. At last year's per acre production, this means 4,738,000 bushels.

The soybean is a new weapon in the war against hunger. Soybean products include the valued protein for livestock, dairy and poultry feeding, and the oil for margarine, shortening and a variety of other foods. Soybeans have become this country's most valuable single export.

Like cottonseed, the soybean produces a nutritious oil for human food purposes. Margarine is one of the major products of this oil. American margarine last year utilized well over a billion pounds of refined soybean oil, and thus provided its second largest outlet. Cottonseed, and corn oils also went into margarine.

With tighter supply situations coming up in some agricultural commodity fields, these oilseeds can fill the gap. For example, the Department of Agriculture is no longer able to supply butter because CCC holdings are exhausted. With the recent raise in the dairy support price, it is a question when CCC will have more butter for the various donation programs the Department administers.

Like many consumers, in this situation the Department has decided to fill the temporary requirement for table spread with margarine. It has been buying margarine for welfare and institutional aid programs, off and on, as needed, since December 1964. In so doing, incidentally, it has saved over $30 million and has had to call principally on soybean oil as a major component of the margarine.

It may be necessary for the Department to adopt a similar bridgeover buying of margarine for the school lunch program. If so, soybean oil margarines again will be called upon as "reinforcements" so long as the dairy situation remains as it is.

It makes sense to use an alternate produce when it is available to fill a real need that cannot otherwise be met without large additional costs and disruption of commercial markets.

Flood of Municipal Industrial Development Bond Financing Curtails Legitimate Municipal Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, critics of the use of tax-exempt municipal bonds to finance commercial or industrial activities have long predicted that one consequence of a flood of this financing would be to drive up interest rates on all municipal bonds. This would raise the cost of financing much-needed public facilities like hospitals, schools, roads, and sewers. It might even prevent the construction of some of these facilities by municipalities which are priced out of the market by higher interest costs.

In a June 16 speech to the White House Conference of State Legislative Leaders, Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, predicted:

> These arrangements, moreover, by greatly increasing the total of exempt bonds outstanding, will eventually drive up the interest rates paid by all states and municipalities for their borrowing.

Today bond markets are deluged by municipal industrial development bonds. These issues have grown from a volume of $12 million in 1955 to $200 million in 1965. Already in the first 6 months of this year, $325 million have been issued or announced; and estimates for the year as a whole range from a conservative $700 million up to $1 billion or more.

At $1 billion, State and local, tax-exempt financing of private business is huge by any measure. It is more than 20 percent of the $4.7 billion of new corporate bonds issued by all manufacturing firms in 1965. It is about 10 percent of the $10 to $11 billion annual total of all State and local securities marketed in the past 2 years. It is more than 10 percent of the total new issues of the Federal Government in 1965.

In part as a result of this flooded bond market, these predictions have now been affirmed. On July 21, the Wall Street Journal reported that Mississippi offered for sale four bond issues totaling $17,433,000. Two of the bond issues were to finance improvements in the port facilities of Gulfport and Pascagoula, another would pay for capital improvements at various State institutions and junior colleges, and a fourth would be used to finance improvements to the State penitentiary.

Only the small $300,000 penitentiary issue which matures in 5 years was sold. The interest rate was just under 4 percent.

The State rejected as too costly a bid of nearly 4.1 percent interest on the bond issue to improve State institutions. The other two port facility offerings carried a maximum interest limitation of 4 percent and consequently, no bids were received.

All four bond issues were rated Double A by Moody's and Single A by Standard & Poor's.

As a result of the high interest rates on municipal bonds—in part the consequence of the glutted municipal bond market—Mississippi will have to look elsewhere for financing for its needed public improvements.

The July 21 Wall Street Journal article follows:

FOUR MISSISSIPPI ISSUES OFFERED, BUT ONLY ONE, $300,000 BONDS, IS SOLD—STATE REJECTS BIDS ON $13,683,000 BONDS AND FAILS TO RECEIVE ANY ON TWO ISSUES TOTALING $3,450,000

(By a Wall Street Journal staff reporter)

JACKSON, MISS.—Mississippi offered four bond issues totaling $17,433,000 for sale, but awarded only the smallest issue, totaling $300,000. It rejected bids for $13,683,000 of bonds and failed to receive bids on the other two issues, totaling $3,450,000.

The $300,000 general-obligation penitentiary bond issue, maturing in five years, was awarded to Deposit Guaranty National Bank of Jackson, Miss., bidding alone, at an annual net interest cost of 3.9955%.

The state treasurer's office, however, rejected both bids it received for its biggest issue—$13,683,000 general improvement bonds. The apparent best bid, offering an annual net interest cost of 4.0827%, came from a group headed by Chase Manhattan Bank, Blyth & Co. and Lehman Brothers. A group led by First National City Bank offered an annual net interest cost of 4.2260%.

TRYING FOR 4-PERCENT BID

"We obviously were hoping for a bid under 4%, but I don't think any of us were too surprised the bids were over 4% in view of the bond market situation," said State Treasurer William F. Winter, noting that "Louisiana rejected a bid over 4.50% recently." Mr. Winter said he didn't know of any civil rights protests against the Mississippi bond offering and didn't believe the recent civil rights march in the state had any detrimental effect on the bids it received for its bonds.

Before its bid was rejected, the Chase-Blyth-Lehman group was reoffering the bonds to investors, subject to award, from a yield of 3.75% for the July 1, 1967, maturities to a dollar price of 100½ for 4% bonds, due July 1, 1977–86.

All of the bonds are rated double-A by Moody's and single-A by Standard & Poor's. Proceeds were to have been used for capital improvements at various state institutions and junior colleges.

NO BID ON PORT ISSUES

The state failed to draw any bids for two port issues totaling $3,450,000 and carrying a maximum interest limitation of 4%. Proceeds from these bonds would have gone for improvements at Gulfport and Pascagoula.

Mr. Winter said that state will finance construction slated to be supported by the $13,683,000 general improvement bonds from short-term loans from local banks. He said several alternative financing plans, including short-term borrowing, are being studied for the planned port improvements.

Compared with other recent municipal issues, the 4.0827% "didn't look like a bad bid," Mr. Winter declared. "But the immediacy of our needs isn't such to cause us to pay that rate at this time. We're aware that sooner or later we may have to pay that interest, but we're deferring that decison for several months."

On its previous trip to the bond market, June 23, 1965, Mississippi obtained an annual net interest cost of 3.3487% in selling $8.3 million general improvement bonds, due July 1, 1968–87, and an annual net interest cost of 3.5664% in selling $3.5 million Greater Port of Pascagoula improvement bonds, due June 1, 1969–95.

The 1966 Civil Rights Act: A Federal-State Comparison of Fair Housing

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate on the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966, many questions were raised in connection with title IV, to prohibit discrimination in residential housing transactions by persons in the housing business. Because of these questions I requested statistics and research material relating to fair housing laws in the various States and territories in order to evaluate the impact of title IV on my own State of New York and on the Nation.

The statistics are interesting and revealing and I believe my colleagues will find them helpful in formulating a position with respect to title IV of the bill H.R. 14765.

The State of New York has a more comprehensive law against discrimination than the bill before the House this week. The New York State law prohibits discrimination in the sale, leasing, or rental of all housing except owner-occupied two family dwellings and the rental of a room in an owner-occupied house. Of particular significance is the fact that real estate brokers and lending institutions are specifically covered by the New York State law.

Seventeen States and the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have fair housing laws which go beyond title IV of the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966. These 17 States represent more than 50 percent of the total population of the United States.

The laws of these 17 States cover public housing or publicly assisted housing and all cover private housing. Eight of these States cover single family homes and only two—Michigan and Indiana—exempt realtors. Four States and one territory excludes lending institutions.

The 17 States are Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin.

More than half of all U.S. ctizens live under fair housing law which go beyond the coverage of the legislation now under consideration by this Chamber. The other citizens of the United States are entitled to the same protection for so long as we diminish the rights of a single American, the rights of all American are in danger. Freedom and democracy can make no distinctions with respect to equal treatment of our citizens and I urge my colleagues to formulate their decision upon this principle and to support the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966.

L.B.J.'s Policy Outline Well Timed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's statement of policy in Asia before the American Alumni Council has been received with praise by several newspapers across the country. I am particularly proud that such endorsement is contained in a recent editorial by the Norfolk Daily News of Norfolk, Nebr., one of the Nation's leading smalltown daily newspapers.

This editorial comment recognizes that the President's speech may not have an immediate influence on the leaders of Red China. But it contends the speech will have a valuable impact on other countries—including those behind the Iron Curtain.

I am pleased to submit this editorial for publication in the RECORD:

[From the Norfolk (Nebr.) Daily News, July 14, 1966]

L.B.J.'S POLICY OUTLINE WELL TIMED

Red China's leaders may not be impressed by President Johnson's outline of U.S. policies toward that nation, but the effect of his Tuesday message upon officials in many other countries, especially the neutralist ones or those with Communist sympathies, should be great. This might ultimately help convince the Red Chinese that there is more to be gained from the "peaceful co-existence" which the President offered than there is in pursuing Asian conquest.

President Johnson simply asked the Red Chinese to renounce aggression and to open their doors to the world. This is, at the same time, the most difficult thing for Communists to do.

It was not until after nearly four decades of Communist rule in Russia that its officials opened the doors just a crack. The Communists in East Germany went so far as to provide the ridiculous symbol of their fears by erecting a wall in Berlin. Only recently has there been a relaxing of the barriers that for so long separated the Communist-dominated countries behind the Iron Curtain from the rest of the world.

Red leaders have concluded—and correctly so—that they have much to lose if they end their isolation. The aggressive designs that typify Communist nations merely serve to keep the focus of attention on something other than their domestic problems.

The President has made it clear that Red China has nothing to fear from the U.S. if it halts its exports of terror, and recognizes that "co-operation, not hostility, is the way of the future." Even though the Red Chinese may not listen, the conciliatory speech cannot help but impress other world leaders.

The timing of the policy outline was excellent—for the President could not have spoken convincingly a few months ago while Americans and South Vietnamese were being terrorized in the streets of Saigon and repeatedly ambushed in the jungles of South Viet Nam. Speaking now from a position of strength, the appeal is much more likely to be effective.

Project Headstart Is Tremendously Beneficial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, Project Headstart has proven, in my judgment, to be tremendously beneficial. I had an opportunity for close observation of its operation in the city of Alexandria, Va., last year as a result of the very active interest of my 16-year-old daughter who served as a volunteer participant in the program. Her reports of improvements were most impressive. I believe that the benefits far outweigh the costs of the program—the successes more than overbalance the few instances of failure.

The Sacramento Bee in an editorial in its issue of Wednesday, July 13, 1966, reflects in part the broad public approval of Project Headstart.

I commend the editorial, particularly the closing paragraph, to my colleagues:

[From the Sacramento Bee, July 13, 1966]

ALL START EQUAL?

When Project Head Start was initiated in the attempt to create a better educational opportunity among the disadvantaged very young there was scoffing from the critics it would become just another extravagant governmental boondoggle.

Well, after only a year's operation even the harshest critics have had to pull in their necks in the face of irrefutable testimony that Project Head Start represents a magnificent beginning at helping the disadvantaged prepare for schooling.

Those who are expert in such things have found that the IQ of children enrolled in Head Start programs increases as much as 16 per cent in the exposure. They report there not only has been a marked improvement in the educational potential of these children, the project has helped the disadvantaged to adjust socially. This cannot be considered only a side benefit. In a real sense, this adjustment is absolutely essential to living the fuller, more creative life.

There have been many stories told of the experiences of those working in Head Start programs. Among them include the revelations that in the case of many children, the tots never had a book of their own to open and reveled in their new discovery: The picture and the written word. In the case of another a Negro child was asked what a policeman was. She replied a policeman was someone who would hurt you and throw you in jail. Such was her environmental concept of law, justice, in her tender years.

There also is the story of the teacher who was reading to these tots when a little boy stopped her and asked what the word "love" meant. It had been used in the sentence "The boy loves his father." He had never learned the word in his four years of living.

Every one may be born "equal" but the fortunes of family and environment can make all the difference; and this is where Head Start comes in.

New Opportunity in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, when nations wage war it is rare that they talk to each other with words of sympathy. The more intense the war becomes, the more difficult it becomes to envision the parties negotiating to resolve their differences.

The war in Vietnam has reached that level of intensity where all talk of negotiations begins to sound like propaganda. It is, therefore, highly significant that for the first time in this war the North Vietnamese appear to have responded to a plea by the United States and by voices of humanity everywhere. Ho Chi Minh has reportedly said that there is "no trial in view" for American military prisoners.

In an editorial yesterday morning, the New York Times explored some of the possible implications of this statement. The editorial, which deserves our careful attention, follows:

[From the New York Times, July 26, 1966]

NEW OPPORTUNITY IN VIETNAM

President Ho Chi Minh's statement that there is "no trial in view" for American military prisoners in North Vietnam is a victory for the moral influence of world opinion. That victory transcends the fate of the captive airmen, for it offers hope that common sense and common humanity ultimately may prevail against the ever greater barbarism the war in Vietnam daily inflicts on both sides.

The United States has yielded to the pressure of world opinion in the past by offering peace proposals and twice suspending the bombing of North Vietnam. But this is the first time that Hanoi has shown regard for the opinion of mankind. Its decision to back away from talk of "war crimes trials" follows direct pleas from Secretary General Thant, Pope Paul VI, numerous governments and opinion leaders everywhere, including eighteen liberal American Senators. The hope now must be that reason can prevail on the broader issues of the war itself.

The conflict in Vietnam is a political struggle that, in the end, can only be resolved by political means. In politics, timing is of the essence. A number of opportunities to probe the prospects for peace have been neglected in the past. It is vital that the new atmosphere and the new opportunity opened by Hanoi's response on the prisoner issue not be missed as well.

The approach favored by American moderates and long urged by The Times has just been summed up admirably by Prof. Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. One essential element is to stop the Americanization of the war by halting the American buildup in South Vietnam; a quarter of a million American troops is more than enough. The second vital element is a civilian Government in Saigon that can open contact with the insurgent forces. Third, is the need to build an atmosphere conducive to negotiations by tapering off the bombing of North Vietnam. Finally, efforts to reconvene the Geneva conference must be linked with broad diplomatic discussions with Moscow, Paris and other interested states to find a formula for the neutralization and economic development of Southeast Asia as a whole.

Most of all, what is needed is a clear indication that the American objective is not military victory but political settlement. The American ability to escalate the war needs no further demonstration. The need now is to halt the escalation and make a vigorous new effort to achieve peace.

Great Lakes Commission States Federal Water Pollution R. & D. Must Be Directed to Development of Effective New Waste Treatment Processes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, water pollution problems mount in the Nation, and it has long been known that the best available conventional waste treatment plants fail to do more than retard the growth of pollution. Yet the Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee found in a recent investigation that Federal R. & D. is not organized toward the development and actual field-scale testing of advanced treatment plants. Work on development of new technology proceeds at a mere $5 million per year level, permitting only pilot-project-scale tests, while the remainder of some $30 million per year in Federal R. & D. is diffused into small, scattered research studies. Many of these are no doubt useful, but they are no substitute for a deliberate, well-organized program directed to the development of an adequate technology which could start reversing the tide of pollution in every stream, river, and lake in the country.

The executive director of the Great Lakes Commission, Mr. Leonard J. Goodsell, in a letter to me deplores this failure to direct Federal R. & D. to the development of new, effective treatment methods. Mr. Goodsell's letter follows:

GREAT LAKES COMMISSION,
Ann Arbor, Mich., July 20, 1966.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: The Milwaukee Journal on July 10 carried an account of the report of your Subcommittee on Research and Technical Programs, Committee on Government Operations which deplores the "Slow Research Pace in Pollution—."

The Great Lakes Commission attempts to follow closely the activities of all who work toward the wise use and conservation of the waters of the Great Lakes. The Commission, as you know, is thoroughly interested in pollution control and abatement and has on several occasions pointed up the need for new ways (procedures and methods) and new technology to eliminate entry or remove the pollutants from Great Lakes basin waters.

May I be permitted a few remarks in furtherance of yours of July 9, 1966.

In the research effort:

Many, many are collecting data, much of it duplicating that already collected or being collected by others.

Very few are processing data already gathered to make it useable and useful.

Very little is being done to devise new, really effective means of treating waste materials or sewage; e.g., we are still being told to accomplish conventional secondary treatment of waste materials and "to maximize phosphate and nitrate removal."

It appears impossible to find, despite the large fund expenditures already made for research, an answer to a specific problem.

We should direct our attention more toward the mission approach rather than the pure or theoretical research approach in order to derive at least some benefit from the dollars being spent for research.

Possibly, the answer is more in the direction of managing and directing the use of the research dollars available than a further wholesale application of funds.

Your leadership is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Leonard J. Goodsell,
Executive Director.

Congratulations, Young and Collins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to extend my heartiest congratulations to Astronauts John W. Young and Michael Collins for their near-perfect space flight last week, and under unanimous consent I place an editorial from the Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel, which lauds the spacemen for this sucessful venture, in the Record at this point:

Stars From Outer Space

Two more stars—named John W. Young and Michael Collins—fell out of space into the Atlantic Ocean. Precisely as planned. And like America's other Astronauts they brought a pocketful of firsts back from the heavens with them.

During their three days in orbit, the Gemini-10 twins set a space altitude record of 476 miles. Also, Collins not only walked in space—he worked, collecting two boxes of "space dust" from which scientists may determine whether living organisms exist in the void.

But perhaps the most dazzling first was their "space bus" ride—docking with Agena-10 rocket, then using the rocket's power system to boost them into higher orbit for a rendezvous with the Agena-8 target vehicle lofted four months ago.

Steering fuel shortage caused some additional planned maneuvers to be scratched. Collins lost a still camera and a third space dust sample box (empty) while walking around outside the capsule. And the Astronauts had a "smog" problem when their oxygen system malfunctioned for a time.

But these relatively minor mishaps only dramatize the near-perfection America's team of space scientists, engineers and Astronauts has achieved. They have succeeded to making the miraculous seem almost commonplace.

For which all of them deserve uncommon thanks and congratulations on the success of yet another in the series of missions preparatory to a manned moon landing by 1969.

A Timely and Articulate View of U.S. Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, a most lucid and eloquent statement of the goals of the U.S. foreign aid program was published earlier this month in an editorial in the Ann Arbor News, a newspaper published in my district of Michigan. The News is a frequent recipient of awards for excellence in journalism. In the last paragraph of the statement, the editor summarized his arguments as follows:

> The United States' role in Asia, as well as in Latin America and Africa, should be to encourage those countries with a heart and mind to do so, to establish those political and social condtions and national institutions against which communism and revolution lose all powers of penetration. Thus communism in Asia must be contested on other fronts than the military. If the United States does not work to create strong, stable societies in Asia, one Vietnam may lead to another.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I append the entire text of this thoughtful and provocative editorial at this point in the Congressional Record:

From Our Point of View: U.S. Aid Most Effective Before Hostilities Start

One question rarely raised in connection with the war in Viet Nam is what would happen if the conflict in Asia became a two, three or even four-front war. What would be the U.S. response, for example, to a reopening of hostilities in Korea, an invasion from the north into Thailand, suspected Red guerrilla activity in Malaysia all occurring at about the same time and all while the Viet Nam war drew heavily on U.S. military strength?

Would the Americans again come to the aid of the Koreans a la 1950? Would the U.S. send troops to defend SEATO ally Thailand against the invaders, and if Malaysia asked for American help against aggression would we send men to that country?

These questions are based on two premises: (1) that Red China, which has conquered Tibet, invaded India and threatened the Thais, will continue to encourage "wars of national liberation" and (2) that the loci of confrontation, military or otherwise, between the Communists and the so-called democracies in the years ahead will be in Asia, not in Europe or Latin America or even in Africa.

For reasons of her own, Red China has chosen not to send her invaders into India or Burma or Thailand or Laos concurrently with her involvement in Viet Nam. The Chinese certainly have the manpower to make trouble along a number of fronts in Asia, but so far have spared neighboring countries the threat of imminent invasion.

The U.S. has expended blood and treasure in Viet Nam, but the question really is how many Viet Nams could be handle at one time and still keep adequate troop levels at home, in Europe, at Guantanamo and other points around the globe. This country speaks of "containing" communism, but doesn't the containment of communism imply much more than a deployment of our military force against the enemy's, or an array of our troops against "theirs?"

Our goal should be to help people, when they request help, to build the conditions that will be unfavorable to communism or to wars of liberation, i.e., revolution. A war of liberation to succeed must be conducted within the country concerned, by natives of that country. This type of war can be won when conditions prove hospitable, but it is the period before these conditions are established that the U.S. should use to good advantage.

In short, revolution is not exportable as the Communists themselves admit. They may supply aid from outside, but a revolution does not begin and can not succeed without favorable conditions inside. The U.S. role in Asia, as well as in Latin America and Africa, should be to encourage those countries with a heart and mind to do so to establish those political and social conditions and national institutions against which communism and revolution lose all powers of penetration.

Thus communism in Asia must be contested on other fronts than the military. If the U.S. does not work to create strong, stable societies in Asia, one Viet Nam may lead to another and a great opportunity will have been muffed.

Crime Cures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times writes of the breadth of the current study by the President's Special Commission on Crime and urges the States to prepare for action on its report.

Due next January, the report is expected to range from the causes of crime to the apprehension, prosecution, and rehabilitation of offenders.

President Johnson has said the Federal Government intends to help—not supplant—State and local governments in law enforcement. He has recommended that each State form a planning committee to make specific proposals for implementing the Commission's findings. Only about half the States have responded, the newspaper reports, along with the suggestion that none can afford to be indifferent toward crime and its consequences.

I place the Times editorial in the Record at this point:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, July 11, 1966]

Crime: the Search for Cures

A special Presidential commission is completing the first year of its monumental task of studying every aspect of crime and the administration of justice in the United States.

For the first time, the entire spectrum of crime problems is being subjected to systematic, nationwide scrutiny. The commission's report, due next January, will range from the causes of crime to the apprehension, prosecution and rehabilitation of the criminal.

The magnitude of the problems and lack of effective solutions are obvious in the nation's worsening crime statistics.

Yet as the commission's executive director, James Vorenberg, admitted, "The fact is we do not know much about crime—its causes, its extent, or the effectiveness of our system of control."

Vorenberg was addressing the National Governors' Conference, whose members will play an integral role in translating the commission's eventual recommendations into effective action. For President Johnson has emphasized that the federal government intends to help, not supplant, state and local governments in law enforcement.

About half of the states have responded to the President's request for creation of state planning committees which could make specific recommendations for implementing the findings of the commission. Every governor should take such action on behalf of the people of his state.

The commission has found, Vorenberg said, that for the most part not enough resources of men, money and information have been devoted to our police courts and correction systems—and that the available contributions of science and technology have not been adequately applied.

"We do know," he went on, "that the public . . . fails to understand the true complexity of crime and our society's response to it.

"Almost every city in the nation seems to have the problems of over-crowded courts . . . so busy that they are unable to make careful decisions. The result often is an unfairness to both society and the individual, and the conditions in many of our courts almost certainly promote disrespect for the law."

Vorenberg acknowledged the problems created by recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions, particularly the Miranda ruling, which he said was "a source of disappointment and concern."

The commission will attempt to provide answers to all of these compelling questions. As the result of working with 2,000 police agencies as well as numerous courts and correction agencies, it will present the most advanced approaches as a guideline for cities and states throughout the country.

Even before the report is issued, however, all states must prepare by forming planning committees. No governor can afford to be indifferent to crime and its consequences.

Milwaukee Journal Says $20 Billion Spending To Fight Water Pollution Is Just a Beginning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the enormousness of the job of cleaning up America's streams and lakes was illustrated strikingly by a recent Milwaukee Journal editorial pointing out that proposed total spending of $20 billion by Federal, State, and local governments and by industries would be only a beginning.

The Journal also pointed out that more is needed than just increased spending to combat pollution. In addition, there must be much more emphasis on the development of new techniques to prevent and eliminate pollution.

As the Subcommittee on Research and Technical Programs has pointed out, only $5 million has been spent on research on advanced waste treatment processes while billions have been allocated to research and development in the fields of defense, atomic energy, and space.

I include the Journal editorial hereafter:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, July 18, 1966]

ONLY A START ON POLLUTION

The senate has passed a bill which calls for spending $6.2 billion over six years on the staggering job of cleaning up the nation's polluted waterways. Coupled with dollars to be contributed by states, communities and industries, this would add up to an estimated $20 billion effort. The measure now goes to the house.

This sounds like, and is, an enormous amount of money. But Senator MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, was quite correct when he called it only "a minimum start."

The awesome size of the problem is indicated by three figures, two of direct interest to Wisconsin. It has been estimated that it will require a $20 billion public-private effort to clean up the Great Lakes. The cost of separating Milwaukee's troublesome combined sanitary-storm sewer system will be at least $200 million and probably a lot more. About 1,900 American communities have similar combined systems. It would cost up to $30 billion to separate them and avoid the dumping of untreated wastes into waterways during rainy weather.

It is not simply a question of spending more money against pollution; it is a matter of how best to spend it. Development of new treatment techniques has lagged shockingly in a nation which prides itself on the quality of its advanced research. The house government operations subcommittee noted recently that of $16 billion in federal money lavished annually on research and development—mostly in defense, space and atomic energy—but $5 million has been spent on research on advanced waste treatment processes.

Instead of pouring still more money into old and outmoded treatment facilities and methods it would be far more practical to spend more money on advanced treatment research. The senate bill does provide $125 million over five years to help finance demonstration projects on sewage treatment and water purification. It still isn't enough.

A panel of the president's science advisory committee caught the urgency of the water crisis last year when it reported: "Pollution touches us all. We are at the same time polluters and sufferers from pollution. Today, we are certain that pollution adversely affects the quality of our lives. In the future, it may affect their duration."

After 20 Hard Years, Our Side Has the Asian Ball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, the subject of U.S. policy toward Asia has received considerable attention in the Congress, within the executive branch of our Government, in our academic circles, in the press, and in other media of communication.

I am happy, indeed, that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, took an early lead in this debate. Our last year's hearings on the "Sino-Soviet Split," and this year's hearings on "U.S. Policy Toward Asia," in effect opened the doors to the current far-ranging discussion of our relations with the continent which is the home of more than one-third of the human race.

This subject, the subject of our foreign policy toward Asia, certainly merits our utmost consideration because it affects directly the prospect of peace and freedom throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have been perturbed by the fact that during recent months, excessive pessimism has come to dominate the public airing of these issues. We hear daily predictions of dire things to come, of dangers and pitfalls which allegedly lie along the road of our foreign policy. While I believe that we must always keep our eyes open, and provide for the possibility that things may go wrong, I also feel that we ought to strive for a balanced presentation of issues, especially issues as important as this one. This balanced approach, it seems to me, has been missing from much of the discussion of our policy toward Asia.

I was delighted, therefore, to read a report by Mr. Keyes Beech which appeared in the July 12 edition of the Miami Herald. This report, written on the scene in Asia, provides the element which has been missing from many other presentations on this subject: it cites facts and figures about the progress of free Asia, and the important role which U.S. foreign policy has played in making that progress possible.

I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Beech, who authored this report, is acknowledged to be one of the foremost journalistic experts on Asia. He has lived on that continent, and he has covered developments in that part of the world for American newspapers since the end of World War II. I believe, therefore, that his assessment of the situation in Asia, and of the prospects for the future, warrant our close attention.

In the belief that other Members of Congress would like to read this report, I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, July 12, 1966]

AFTER 20 HARD YEARS—TORRENT OF GOOD NEWS: OUR SIDE HAS THE ASIAN BALL

(By Keyes Beech)

CHIENGMAI, THAILAND.—It's almost as though the dam had burst, unleashing a flood of good news.

It could be that after more than two decades of toil and trouble Asia has reached that long-awaited turning point when the non-Communist nations are in the ascendancy and communism is on the decline.

If that is indeed the case, then the United States has more than a little cause for satisfaction.

Patience and perseverance, it seems are American as well as Oriental virtues. The end of the road is not in sight, but with 20 years of fumbling and frustration, more than $20 billion of economic and military aid and two wars to check Communist aggression, a semblance of stability seems to be emerging from the collapse of the old order in Asia. In any event, from Korea to Karachi, all along the sprawling periphery of Red China, things are looking up for our side.

What makes the good news all the more noteworthy is that it has occurred with astonishing swiftness in a part of the world where history is written with agonizing slowness.

Within the last eight months a series of seemingly unrelated events has tipped the scales in favor of the United States and its allies. Indonesia's rescue from a Communist takeover has resulted in a whole new power shift in Southeast Asia with the Communists on the outside looking in.

For all its problems, Indonesia is set on an anti-Communist course. Today there is hope where none existed before. The Peking-Jakarta link is in ruins and with it Red China's hope to outflank the American positions in Southeast Asia.

Indonesia has ended its ruinous confrontation with Malaysia. British troops have have been withdrawn from the Borneo border. The Philipppines have ended their unwanted dispute with Malaysia. And Thailand is delighted at having brought everybody together. Pakistan's affair with Red China has cooled with the sacking of its handsome, California-educated foreign minister, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. A junior-league Krishna Menon, Bhutto engineered his country's dubious alliance with Peking and Sukarno's Indonesia.

Pakistan can hardly be expected to embrace the United States. But Bhutto's exit at least removed a major irritant to American-Pakistani relations.

The simple fact is that a man like Bhutto has no place in the newly developing scheme of things. There is as President Johnson recently noted, "a new spirit of regional association and regional self-confidence" rising in Asia.

Another way of saying the same thing is that in this jet age Asia has shrunk. Many Asian nations, some of them for the first time, are at last getting acquainted with one another. Instead of looking always toward Washington, London or Paris, they are discovering a common identity of interest under the American umbrella. One manifestation of this trend is the regrouping of Thailand, the Philippines and Malyasia, made possible as the threat of a Communist Indonesia receded. Even that well-known American baiter, Singapore Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew, has come around. Not only is Singapore entertaining American GI's on leave from South Vietnam, but Lee recently observed that it would be a bad thing for the United States to pull out of South Viet Nam prematurely because big nations—Red China for instance—have ways of gobbling up little nations—Singapore for instance.

One of the least noticed but most auspicious events in recent Asian history was a meeting that took place a few weeks ago in Seuol. It brought together nine nations—Japan, Malaysia, Nationalist China, Australia, New Zealand, South Viet Nam, the Philippines, Thailand and South Korea.

The conference produced no ringing declarations. And it resulted only in a loosely formed association called the Asian and Pacific Council.

But the significance of the conference was that nine such disparate nations with widely differing local interests could get together at all. And for the Republic of Korea, so long regarded as an indigent ward of the United States, it was a major diplomatic triumph. South Korea's emergence as an anti-Communist power in the Far East is nothing short of phenomenal.

Japan's presence put a damper on any resounding anti-Communist declaration. But four of the participating nations already have combat troops in South Viet Nam and a fifth, the Philippines, is in the process of making it a majority.

What makes the rise of non-Communist Asia all the more encouraging is the fact that it has a solid economic base. The economic progress of the nations on Red China's periphery is one of the untold stories of modern Asia, reported only piecemeal if at all. It is both a tribute to free enterprise and an affront to the rigidly controlled economies of Red China and its satellites.

Last year the economic growth rate in South Korea was 8 per cent, in Taiwan (Nationalist China) 7 per cent, in Malaysia 5.5 per cent, and in booming Thailand 6 per cent.

With Sukarno and the Communists off its back, there is hope even for Indonesia. And India, under the rather surprising leadership of Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi, is shifting more and more toward a freer economy, much to the indignation of old-fashioned doctrinaire Socialist supporters of her late father. Among the non-Communist nations only Burma, possibly the most mismanaged nation in Asia next to Indonesia, and Cambodia cling to the Socialist path.

If the future is bright for non-Communists it is bleak for the Communists. Since th Indonesian Communist Party hit the skids, communism has undeniably lost its momentum in Asia. The decline of communism has seen a parallel decline the non-Communist left. There was a time 20 years ago when Asian nationalism rested much of its hope on the non-Communist left or Asian socialism. That is no longer true. A new and hard-headed pragmatism has taken command. The fact is that the Asian left is old-fashioned and out of date. It failed to change with the times.

With non-Communist Asia gaining momentum it has become fashionable in some circles to suggest that the best thing for the United States to do is nothing; that left to their own devices Asian nations will find Asian solutions to Asian problems.

It's an attractive prospect and some day it may come true, but the past and present demonstrate that nothing could be farther from the truth.

Only behind the shield of American power has nonCommunist Asia been able to assert itself. Without the United States South Korea would be Communist today. So would South Viet Nam. It is sometimes argued that Indonesia took care of the Communists in its own way without outside help. It's just as well to let that illusion stay undestroyed. But it is by no means to be taken for granted that anti-Communist forces in Indonesia were able to bring off their coup without assistance from the United States.

And without the resolute United States stand in South Viet Nam there would have been little incentive for the anti-Communists to take the gamble that they did.

Nowhere in the world is power—American power in this case—more appreciated than in Asia. And no nation has greater contempt for weaklings than Red China.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereo. (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*	
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Robert G. Dunphy.
Chief Clerk—Darrell St. Claire.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Long of Louisiana, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, McGee, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, Fannin, and Griffin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Randolph (chairman), Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Tydings, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, Murphy, and Griffin.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Michael Rodak, 6311 Joslyn Pl., Cheverly, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—H. C. Hallam, Jr., 113 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Greenspan in the Village of Newark, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in a recent statement on the floor of the Senate concerning agriculture appropriations, I pointed up the vast potential of the cropland adjustment program which established a national policy of paying farmers to leave some of their land idle to avoid overproduction of certain staple crops. I noted at that time that some of this land might well be shifted from agricultural to recreational use.

The Department of Agriculture has initiated a new program known as Greenspan, and I am pleased to report that the first grant was made to the village of Newark in New York State. I hope that this is only the beginning of this very imaginative program and that more effort will be made to transform what is now idle farmland into productive recreational facilities.

I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a copy of a recent editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on this program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREENSPAN

A new method of making surplus land contribute to the amenities of life has been inaugurated by the Department of Agriculture. The program known as "Greenspan" is an outgrowth of the long-established national policy of paying farmers to leave some of their land idle to avoid overproduction of staple crops. To simplify the program and facilitate conservation practices, the department extended its contracts to as long as 5 to 10 years. Then it became apparent that some of this land might well be permanently shifted from agricultural to recreational use without any additional expense. That is the basic idea behind Greenspan.

Secretary Freeman recently conveyed the first Greenspan acres to the village of Newark in the State of New York. Newark found that some of the adjacent surplus land would be useful in its recreational and open-space program. So it is purchasing the land with funds provided by the Department of Agriculture. According to Mr. Freeman, "The Federal payment is figured at the same rate as if the farmer had retained ownership of the land and put it into CAP (Crop Adjustment Program) for a ten-year period."

Much of the country's surplus agricultural land has little or no value for recreational purposes. But where land taken out of cultivation at Federal expense can be advantageously used in a local program for the extension of parks, playgrounds, open space or wildlife preserves, it certainly makes sense to help the community buy it instead of merely paying the farmer to leave it idle.

Areas of this kind will be increasingly valuable to local communities as the competition for space is intensified and the problems of pollution are multiplied. If another 100 million people are added to our population in the next generation, as is often forecast, enormous efforts will be essential to protect our environment from stifling artificiality. Greenspan is only a small venture in this direction, but it can be an important one. It is heartening to learn that more than 30 similar projects are now in the planning stage.

Captive Nations Week Speech by Maj. Gen. John S. Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 16, I was privileged to attend a banquet sponsored by the Indiana Captive Nations Committee. It was a stimulating experience. The scheduled principal speaker for the occasion was Maj. Gen. John S. Anderson, adjutant general for the State of Indiana. Illness prevented General Anderson from making a personal appearance; however, his speech was delivered by Capt. William Aylward.

Mr. Speaker, I commend General Anderson's speech to our colleagues:

SPEECH TO CAPTIVE NATION'S COMMITTEE, JULY 16, 1966

It is a privilege for me to be with you tonight and address such a distinguished group of people dedicated to the worthy and significant objectives, which the Captive Nations organization represents.

Since the majority of you here tonight have lived under communist domination and were fortunate enough to escape it, I would like to speak to you briefly about the immediate threat that communism poses to our own American heritage, and of the obligation we have all inherited by this threat. For blessings carry with them responsibilities, and if we are to assure continued sharing of the blessings for ourselves and our children, we can't shirk these responsibilities.

The threat we face today is total, sinister, unyielding. The enemy seeks to desecrate our most cherished beliefs, to destroy our power, to bury our heritage. They have said so, and there is no rational reason to disbelieve their words or to ignore their acts.

We should remind ourselves that the communist mind is a curious combination of ideological rigidity, tactical suppleness and singleness of purpose.

In the past half century, we have witnessed, and many of you have experienced, an imaginative display of aggressive communist tactics. The goal has always been the same—political domination. But the path to that goal has often changed direction. In our own lifetime communist tactics have ranged through a broad and brutal spectrum; everything from outright occupation by the Red Army in Eastern Europe, through conventional aggression in Korea, to the guerrilla operations in Greece, Malaya, the Philippines and Vietnam.

Communist tactics have sometime fomented revolutions, and at other times have taken advantage of those initiated by others. * * * this occurred in the Dominican Republic. Communist tactics have learned to be at home with legal means as well as with illegal means; with sophisticated societies as well as with primitive ones; with rightist dictators as well as with leftist demagogues. And we must never underestimate their cunning ability to adapt.

The communists respect only determination to resist and strength—the type of strength that is being applied in Vietnam. This is the type of strength and determination that George Washington prescribed in his message to Congress on 3 December 1793. He said:

"There is a rank due to the United States among all nations, which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness—if we desire to avoid insult, we must be ready to repel it. If we desire to secure peace, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

Part of our heritage, which we are defending today in Vietnam, lies in the roots of our American Revolution, and in the galvanism of its noble ideas, which form the hope that freedom's light ultimately will shine over the forces of darkness throughout the world.

Our heritage is based on the belief that all men are created equal, and that true political power does not grow out of the barrel of a gun, but only out of the people themselves—for that is precisely where political power is—within each individual human being.

The American Revolution is a still continuing, sometimes faltering, but ever growing revolution, which aims at achieving the basic hopes of man—freedom with dignity, equality in opportunity, as well as equality under law, and the overall goal of betterment of life for all.

Today the struggle in South Vietnam is not our only area of concern. At the present time it is only the most prevalent. The United States as the strongest nation of the free world can't escape the burden, and the obligation, of keeping the peace. This role has become ours, . . . though certainly we did not seek it, nor we can shirk it. There is scarcely an area outside the bamboo and iron curtains in which our forces are not either directly fulfilling their roles of maintaining the peace, or in assisting our friends and allies to do so. The most obvious examples are, of course, Western Europe, Berlin, Korea, Taiwan, and as members of the Inter-American Peace Force in the Dominican Republic.

The aggressive militant threat of communist power in Asia continues, and that is our basic problem. The primary military threat is, of course, Communist China, and their number one asset is their manpower—During the past year, China's threat has focused increasingly on Vietnam. The Chinese Communists are obviously testing the effectiveness of so-called "wars of national liberation" as an instrument for the achievement of Communist domination over other nations.

The war in Southeast Asia will provide a critical test of the future success or failure of that concept. They must already be having some second thoughts about the ultimate success of these tactics. They probably now realise that they can't force the United States to abandon the free countries of the Far East.

Our military power is by no means the only instrument used in the struggle for peace. Diplomacy, economic policy, foreign economic and military assistance, and military alliances contribute to our security. Military preparedness, however, provides the safeguard which permits these other means the freedom of action to serve our national interests.

The Armed Forces of the United States are not policy making organizations, but merely instruments of policy. But our forces must always be prepared to carry out the policy of the United States, and the tasks set by the American people.

As we look ahead to the tasks that the future probably holds for our armed forces, we do so with some measure of confidence. We know that America has the finest, best-trained and equipped military forces we have ever maintained in peacetime. Although we realize that the future may not be an entirely peaceful one, we are prepared to respond to the requirements that may be demanded of us in building a community of stable nations, where political change can occur peacefully, and where nations have the right to determine their own destiny.

World affairs in the second half of the twentieth century revolve around one key issue, the struggle between democracy and communism. There are many sources of conflict between, and within, nations, but the outcome of the struggle between democracy and communism wil largely determine all other issues that the world faces today.

Most of us think of democracy as a government by the people. Certainly it is this, but it is also a great deal more. In its broadest meaning, democracy applies not only to government, but to all relations between men. Above all, democracy is based on respect for the dignity of man. Where such respect is recognized and practiced, the standards of conduct for both the individual and society are mutual consent rather than force, and truthfulness rather than falsehood.

In the face of the serious challenge posed by communism, democracy cannot survive merely and solely because it is just, because it is right, because it is humane. It can and will survive only because we have the determination to make it survive, because we are willing to sacrifice so that it can flourish, because we are dedicated to its ideals, and because our Armed Forces are the shield through which the enemy cannot penetrate to stab at the vitals of our democratic way of life.

Compare the role of the military under communism to our own. The role assigned to the military under communism and that of the military under democratic government reflect accurately the wide chasm that separates the two ideologies in philosophy, in principle, in objective and in method. The military in a communist society is an aggressive body. If it were otherwise, the Red forces would be a contradiction of the Red philosophy of the world domination. Within the Iron Curtain, the armed forces are not merely servants of the State, they are servants of the communist party which controls the state and all of its organs and institutions. Hence, a Communist Army is a political army, since it is the instrument used to enforce the decisions of a single political party—decisions which express the will of the party and not the freely determined will of the people.

Outside the Iron Curtain the picture is quite different. The armed forces of the democracies are used for defensive purposes, for the protection of freedom, sovereignty, and independence. This is a reflection of the character of the democratic governments which seek no territorial control, which covet no neighbor's land.

In the democracies the armed forces are servants of the entire country not of a single party. In the United States, the President, regardless of his political affiliation, serves as Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces; when a Democratic administration occupies the White House, the armed forces are not Democratic, and under a Republican President, they are not Republican. They are of the country as a whole and responsive to orders from the Government as an expression of the will of the people as a whole.

Any military force, if it is to be effective, must be based on a system of discipline. But in a democracy, discipline does not mean tyranny. In the United States Armed Forces, the system of discipline is shaped within a basic framework of democratic concepts and is designed to safeguard America's democratic institutions from their enemies.

The choice of democracy over communism has been dramatically shown by the peoples of the world who have been forced to endure the communist doctrine. Between 1950 and 1961, when the border between East and West Berlin was sealed, nearly four million East Germans fled from communist-controlled East Germany to West Germany. This was about one-sixth of the entire population—a vivid illustration of how eagerly people escape from communist domination, if they have a chance to do so. Other examples include the 171,000 North Korean and Chinese prisoners of war, who, after the Korean Conflict, chose not to return to their communist homelands. During the Hungarian Revolution in 1956, 200,000 Hungarians fled to Austria; in 1959 when Tibet was overrun by Red China, 40,000 Tibetans fled to India. When Vietnam was divided by the 17th Parallel in 1954, establishing Communist North Vietnam and the Free Republic of South Vietnam, many thousands of refugees who chose not to be dominated by communism, fled to the south.

Statistics show that world communism, plagued by internal dissension and political reversals on the international front, has suffered heavy membership losses.

As a result of setbacks in Indonesia and elsewhere, a recently completed survey estimated that as of January 1966, Communist Party membership in non-communist countries was nearly two-million less than at the beginning of 1965—a decline from 4,500,000 to 2,600,000 active participants in the one-year period.

The membership losses by party organizations operating in non-communist countries were so extensive—42 percent—that they more than made up for additions to party rolls in Communist-ruled states and brought about a net loss of some 600,000 members for the entire communist movement.

Total membership in all of the world's Communist parties is now estimated to be 43.9 millions, all but a relative handful (less than six percent) affiliated with the ruling organizations of the 14 states where the Communists are in power.

However, there has never yet been a single instance where people have fled in large numbers from a non-communist to a communist country.

Throughout history, human liberty has survived not because it is inherently good, but because men and women were willing to make great sacrifices for its preservation. As the greatest of human goods, liberty has the highest price. This was clearly recognized by the signers of the Declaration of Independence, who, at the conclusion of the document, vowed to defend its ideals with their lives, fortunes and sacred honor. Nothing less will do today.

Thus, the struggle between the free world and communist tyranny will be determined by the side that is willing to make the greater effort and the greater sacrifice.

The Captive Nations Committee and its goals point up, with glowing significance, the longing desire of people to be free from communist enslavement. Those of you who have lived under communist rule know probably better than anyone the blessings of a democratic way of life, the right of choice, freedom of worship, freedom of speech and those rights and privileges we as a free nation, hold most dear. Those rights which we are prepared to defend at all cost.

Our goal is the achievement of world peace and the right for peoples of all lands to have the blessing of freedom. We can ill-afford to take our cherished freedom for granted. For as long as there are those who would sever the lifeline of liberty, we must be, and are, constantly prepared to defend it. And we stand ready to defend the rights of other nations against communist domination.

The principal pride in the uniform of the United States Army is not the sergeants stripes, the captains bars, or even the generals stars, but the little pieces of metal that say U.S.

In closing I would like to quote a statement made by the President of the United States, which I feel is appropriate to this occasion:

"Our own freedom and growth have never been the final goal of the American dream. We were meant to be an oasis of liberty and abundance in a worldwide desert of disappointed dreams. Our nation was created to help strike away the chains of ignorance and misery and tyranny wherever they keep man less than God means him to be."

Ladies and gentlemen, it is time for all of us on this small, whirling planet to insure that this forecast will prevail.

Thank you.

The Whitney Museum in the Heart of Manhattan

SPEECH

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, a new edifice has risen in the heart of my district.

It is the new Whitney Museum of American Art at the corner of Madison Avenue and 75th Street.

It is designed by Marcel Breuer, who has just been chosen to design the new Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial in Washington, D.C., by the F.D.R. Memorial Commission of which I am a member.

The old Whitney Museum was located at 22 West 54th Street and has been sold to the Museum of Modern Art.

On September 28, the new Whitney Museum of American Art will open to join the ranks of the other world-renowned institutions of culture.

The New York Times of Saturday, July 23, forecast the advent in an interesting article by Sanka Knox, which follows:

MADISON AVENUE NOW HAS A CASTLE—THE WHITNEY MUSEUM'S NEW HOME STIRS IMAGINATIONS

(By Sanka Knox)

A seven-story inverted step pyramid on Madison Avenue, a fortress of brooding granite that the Whitney Museum of American Art has built as its new home, is in the last stages of being readied for its opening on Sept. 28.

Inside the corner building at 75th Street, the reaches of wall and floor are still vacant. Paintings and sculpture are still in storage. Workmen are polishing stone and completing intricate electrical installations; curators are plotting the staging of the opening show.

The barely finished new home of American art has already created a stir on and off the avenue.

The dark, strangely attractive structure designed by Marcel Breuer has been winning an unusual amount of neck-craning from passers-by.

To the suggestible, Mr. Breuer's dark contribution to the area's conventional, fashionable environs is irresistibly romantic.

The massively jutting overhangs remind some of the famous Egyptian tomb at Saqqara—but upside down. To others, the building seems a moated castle, with a bridge and, high above on the uppermost overhang, a "mystery" window.

MOAT IS NOT FOR WATER

The "moat" is a sunken sculpture court. Mr. Breuer's oddly and somewhat playfully contrived windows—the large one in front and a sprinkling on the 75th Street side—will probably vie with the exhibits as sculptural attractions.

The Whitney now has three times the exhibition space it had in its previous quarters at 22 West 54th Street, which it sold to the Museum of Modern Art for $2-million.

The opening show of 385 works will occupy the entire museum in a comprehensive survey of American art.

"We've had cooperation of an unusual kind," Lloyd Goodrich, the director, said. "Institutions and private owners who don't usually lend are letting us have some marvelous examples—Winslow Homer, Church, Ryder, Eakins and others."

RETURN TO PRE-1900 ART

Museums include the Metropolitan, Brooklyn, the New York Historical Society. Something over half the show will be 20th-century art, the majority of it pieces owned by the Whitney.

The rest will be works from before 1900, a period of native art that the Whitney abandoned in 1949. Now, the museum wants to retrieve its lost ground.

"We will again build up our historical collection," Mr. Goodrich said. "But this will have to be by gift and bequest, for the most part."

Like the flame-treated granite blocks of the exterior, the materials used inside the museum give an impression of strength and endurance. The floors are of split slate, the walls of rough texture. Stairs are of stone or terrazzo, banisters of teakwood.

Some of the walls are of hand-finished cement and stone conglomerate that defies marks. The stretches of stone in the lobby are lighted by 370 ceiling lamps set in fixtures like inverted mushroom caps.

All kinds of new activities are being planned. The museum now has an auditorium and, adjacent to it, a large gallery with a parquet floor set into the slate surround. "For dancing," said Mr. Goodrich, smiling.

Off the sculpture garden will be a restaurant and cafeteria. Among other innovations in the Whitney's facilities is a restoration laboratory.

All-American Quarterback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I share the pride of the people of Tennessee in a native son, Marion Sadler. Mr. Sadler was born in Clarksville, in my congressional district, and through brilliance and hard work has risen from a $90-a-month ticket agent to president of one of the Nation's largest airlines, American. The following excellent article about Mr. Sadler's exceptional career appears in the July 1966 issue of Finance:

ALL-AMERICAN QUARTERBACK

They are a rugged lot, this second generation of airline executives.

If you were to turn a corner and suddenly collide with Marion Sadler of American Airlines, chances are he'd knock you back for a two-yard loss. Bull-necked and barrel-chested, Sadler at 55 is built like a Chicago Bear alumnus, and even today his craggy features would not seem out of place behind a line-backer's face guard.

But Sadler functions more as a quarterback at American Airlines where, as president and chief operations officer, he calls the operational signals. C. R. Smith, a pioneer in the air transport industry, is chairman and chief executive at American and still calls the plays. But the betting goes that in a year or two Smith will be retiring and Sadler will take over the top management post.

This sort of succession seems to be standard operating procedure throughout the industry these days. The old fly-boys, the Lindys and the Rickenbackers who swash-buckled around the country in rickety biplanes and monomotored monoplanes, already have left the stage. And now their contemporaries slowly but surely are hanging up their helmets and goggles, too.

At Eastern, Floyd Hall, 50, has been moved into Rickenbacker's seat. At Delta, Charlie Dolson is ready to take over from "Big C. E." Woolman, who first learned to fly in an OX5 Jenny. At United, George Keck, 54, stands ready behind crusty old Bill Patterson. Ernest Breech, 69, is retiring from TWA in favor of Charlie Tillinghast, 55, (with Howard Hughes watching somewhere in the wings). L. B. Maytag, who now runs National, is 40, and Harding Lawrence, Braniff boss, is 45.

The new generation may not have the same pioneer toughness as the men who got into flying as an adventure in the Twenties and gradually built it into a business in the Thirties, but the Tillinghasts, the Halls, the Kecks and the Sadlers are equally tough in their own way.

While the pioneers competed chiefly with the law of gravity, the second generation compete with each other—and Uncle Sam often joins in to make it a free-for-all. There is no more dynamic industry than air transport on or off the face of the earth. Since 1950, the airlines have been growing almost twice as fast as any other industry (almost 15 per cent annually to electronics' 8 per cent) and more than four times as fast as the gross national product.

Still, aviation experts say that the fastest growth of air transport yet may lie ahead.

Says Sadler: "Yes, suh. The opportunities certainly are there—but so are the problems." And he shrugs his massive shoulders.

Despite his bruiser's physique. Sadler has never played serious football—not even at Duke where, the legend has it, everybody but Doris tries out for the team. At Duke, Sadler took an A.B. and an M.A. in English, and after graduating in 1932, began teaching the stuff to high school kids in Bristol, Tennessee, not far from Clarkesville, where he was born.

Sadler speaks his college major accurately, colorfully and with a force that is partly concealed under a magnolia accent. He also listens well, and learns fast. For exampe, it did not take him very long at Bristol High to learn that if everyone were paid a high school teacher's salary, income tax consultants would never have to worry about being overweight.

But jobs during the Great Depression were not to be given up lightly. Sadler stuck it out at Bristol High until 1941, when he spotted an American Airlines ad in the local paper. American, awakening to its need for people who could read and write as well as people who could buckle swashes, had decided to offer college graduates $90 a month to work as ticket agents. Since the salary offered by American represented a 12% increase over what Bristol High was offering. Sadler jumped at the chance. Besides, like every other red-blooded youth who grew up in the Twenties idolizing the Spirit of St. Louis, a career in aviation had been Sadler's daily daydream.

Pearl Harbor helped many a young man achieve this ambition the hard way. Sadler spent the war in the Air Transport Command, emerging as a staff sergeant. Deciding to cash in his G.I. bill for a Ph. D., Sadler matriculated in 1946 at the University of North Carolina. But when he discovered that the Ph. D. who was teaching him was only pulling down $5,000 a year, Sadler realized that his early fears at Bristol about the financial unrewards of academic life needed no further confirmation.

American Airlines was glad to get him back at $175 a month as a ticket agent. By 1951, Sadler had moved up to district manager in the Buffalo office and it was in this capacity that he made his breakthrough into American's upper management. The vehicle: a special manual for American's sales agents. Although the thing was child's play for an English M.A., it was regarded as a brilliant tour de force by an industry long on transportation skills but short on literary talent.

C. R. Smith, who had his eye out for a successor, awarded Sadler American's highest tribute—the Distinguished Service Award for Merit. By 1955, the Tennessean was director of all passenger sales. In 1957, he became vice president in charge of customer service, and in 1959 he moved up to vice president and general manager.

Sadler moved into the president's office in January, 1964, only to discover that although he had become in title No. 2 man, staff officials handling finance, management development, planning and economic research were still reporting to Bill Hogan, executive vice president and chairman of the finance committee. The picture seemed to be this: Smith was No. 1, Sadler was No. 2 in title but No. 3 in function, and Hogan was No. 3 in title but ranked Sadler in authority and responsibility.

Sadler resigned—just like that.

Sadler does not comment on his reasons for giving up what seemed to be—at least potentially—one of the most exciting and challenging jobs in the nation. But executives in other airlines, who keep as closely tuned to American's affairs as Gimbel's does to Macy's, say that a personality conflict or blowup between Hogan and Sadler was *not* the reason for Sadler's abrupt departure from American early in 1964.

Hogan, a financial magician who raised the capital to support American's development in the airline's highly uncertain formative years in the Forties and Fifties, was a widely respected executive at American.

Among his strong supporters was Sadler. Hogan had reciprocated this respect by supporting Sadler's move up through the ranks—although some industry observers doubt that Hogan expected Sadler to move up quite so fast or quite so far.

WRONG DEDUCTION

"Naturally, Hogan would have liked the presidency," an executive at another major trunk said a few days ago, "but people who think Hogan tried to sabotage Sadler after he got the job simply are wrong. The trouble was that C. R. had not been definite enough in allocating authority and responsibility when Marion became president. So the staff continued to report to Hogan as they had been doing before Marion moved in."

Apparently, C. R. hastily got his errant ducks in a row, for in two weeks Sadler was back as No. 2.

A day with Sadler can be exhausting, for a day with Sadler is usually a day on the move. He can make it from his modest office in American's Third Avenue headquarters to American's communications center in a nearby suite in less than ten seconds, and when he's in New York he tries to crack the record several times a day. In the communications center, visibility is unlimited with respect to the operational status of American's 157 passenger planes and 14 freighters. Illuminated graphs give the whereabouts and whenabouts of all arrivals and departures. Short-wave radio can put Sadler immediately in touch with planes in the air as well as those on the ground.

Sadler spends many days away from New York checking on American's performance in the 50 U.S. cities the line serves. A basically cheerful guy, Sadler can first-name at least a thousand of the 26,160 men and women on the carrier's staff. But he also can ream when he finds service techniques are not optimum. To Sadler, the quality of American's service always will be the first, second and third most important yardsticks for measuring how effectively American is meeting the strenuous competition it gets from the other major domestic trunks (United and TWA).

As American's roving advocate, Sadler also spends considerable time in Washington romancing the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency.

Have a drink or two with other airline spokesmen and sooner or later they'll be griping about "Johnson's idiotic appointments of people to the CAB who don't know a damn thing about our problems."

But all Sadler will say is, "It's up to us to help Washington see our problems and come up with solutions all of us can live with."

Since the intrepid gallants who pioneered the airlines were intense individualists by nature, there has never been any concerted effort on the part of the industry to push its case in Washington. Sadler and the other second-generation kingpins only now seem to be realizing the wisdom of the old business about "In union there is strength." Professional lobbyists in the nation's capital evaluate air transport's lobbying skills as down near the bottom of the list. The pros say one reason why some aviation executives are so highly critical of Johnson and the CAB is that the CAB has been confused about what the air transport industry really wants—the airlines seldom can get together long enough to speak with one voice.

A ten-minute visit to any American Airlines executive office will make clear what American wants—a bigger share of the market. In the past six years or so, American has lost ground: from about 30% of the market to about 20%. A big chunk of the loss was inevitable. Regional carriers bought jets and increased their capacity. But some of the loss reflects sharper competition from United, TWA, and Eastern. Some industry experts say that while Sadler seems to be as firmly entrenched at American as his counterparts are at their airlines, if American doesn't start recapturing some of its lost business, Sadler's seat in the saddle may prove to be less permanent than it now looks.

One special problem of American that will be bugging its president is the airline's route limitations. American is landlocked. Except for short side trips to Canada and Mexico, American is authorized to fly only East-West over the continental United States. But the big advantage of jets is that they can carry big loads long distances, which means that the lines that can go farthest with the most are going to make more money than the short-haulers—all other things being equal. (And when are they?)

With the far-ranging jumbo jets and SST's on the way, American has been pushing hard for an overseas certificate. Sadler doesn't worry about filling the oncoming bigger carriers with a profitable payload. He feels the tremendous boom in passenger traffic is bound to continue over the next decade as the population swells, as discretionary incomes rise, and as John Doe, nature's most curious animal, takes off to see for himself how Arthur Doe lives on the other side of the mountains, or how Pierre and Antonio and Hans handle the action across the water.

American's operating chief says, "Although passenger traffic is certain to grow by leaps and bounds during the next decade, freight haulage will grow even faster."

Present growth curves bear him out. In 1965, air cargo for the whole industry was twice as much as in 1958 and was 1/3 higher than in 1964. Once again, the jet was the big catalyst. In 1963, American (historically an industry leader in air freight) broke new ground when it put in operation four Boeing 707–323C all-cargo jets. Prior to this, all jet craft had served a dual passenger-freight purpose.

The delivery of the cargo jets coincided with American's 22nd anniversary in the air freight business. Sadler's outfit is easily the biggest domestic carrier of freight (mail excluded), and by the looks of things, American is going to be hard to catch in the future.

In May, for example, American continued to widen its lead over its two biggest domestic rivals—United and TWA. Excluding mail, American haulage of air cargo in May 1966 was 52.3% higher than May 1965. United was up 34.7%, and TWA 32%.

American's revenue from freight still is only 10% of its passenger take, but as C. R. Smith predicted recently, freight traffic has been growing so fast that it probably will overtake passenger carriage in eight or ten years.

In terms of overall growth opportunities, the horizons for freight are limitless. Although the U.S. air transport industry probably will exceed 2.5 billion freight-ton miles (a ton of freight carried a mile equals one freight-ton mile) this year, this total still won't exceed 2% of all the freight-ton miles produced by all U.S. transportation sectors.

AIR CARGO BITES

Sadler and his colleagues at American are convinced, however, that in the next decade, air cargo will be taking formidable bites out of the total transportation pie. If American's present plans materialize, American's share of international freight haulage is going to skyrocket. (Pan American is now the worldwide leader.)

American has put in a bid for a certificate that would, if granted by the CAB, allow the line to break its present shackles and fly across the Pacific. The operative words here are "if granted." Just about every other major carrier in the nation also has applied and it's fairly certain that only four or five of the 20-odd lines will get the green light from the CAB for Pacific service.

Neither Sadler nor anyone else at American will discuss their chances of being awarded a highly-prized Pacific certificate. Says Sadler, "Only the CAB will decide, and the decision probably won't be known for some months."

Industry observers think American's chances are as good as anyone else's—and some say a bit better in view of two recent developments. TWA, which now flys to Europe, was given a certificate at the end of May to extend its service, via Bangkok, to Hong Kong. (United already serves Hawaii.)

Then, during the first week of June, a CAB examiner recommended that the last big unassigned air route over the continental U.S.—from the Pacific Northwest to the Southwest—be assigned to Braniff, Continental and Western.

American had been one of 13 carriers with a bid in for this route. When American was passed up, one Washington observer said, "Sadler's chances for getting the run to Tokyo now look considerably better. Compared to the big slice of cake represented in a route to Japan and the Far East, the Northwest-Pacific route was only crumbs. If American had gotten the crumbs, it would have meant not getting the big slice. Now, American could be a winner."

Defense Under Scrutiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, herewith is an article by reputable Reporter-Editor Allen M. Smythe, of the Boston Globe of July 24, 1966, entitled "Defense Under Scrutiny." It involves the careful review and oversight of the House Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of our defense spending and commitments. I would offer two additional observations:

First, insofar as the public is concerned, supplemental appropriations move back to prior fiscal year budgets, moneys which are then seldom accounted for or refigured as deficits.

Second, there is an additional alternate to the Commander in Chief's call upon Congress to hold appropriations to his budget requests or face a tax rise; namely, stop Federal-domestic spending on social experiments.

Overall, the editorial is well worth pondering by our colleagues and I commend it to them:

DEFENSE UNDER SCRUTINY

(By Allen M. Smythe)

On July 1, the Department of Defense had $42 billion in unexpended funds on hand. Much of it is already obligated. An appropriation bill now in the Senate will probably total more than $59 billion and be passed this August. It probably will include funds for Viet Nam that will be exhausted this Winter even if the war would be concluded soon—a very unlikely prospect.

Supplemental appropriations of about $1 billion must be voted next Winter to provide for the third recent military pay raise bill just signed by the President and for $11 to $12 billion to cover the increasing costs of the Viet Nam war.

This adds up to more than $112 billion for defense which all but $8 billion the Pentagon estimates will be spent or obligated by July 1, 1967.

During this fiscal year more than $20 billion will be spent for military personnel. Nearly $2 billion will go to the increasing pensions for the retired military. More than $17 billion will be spent for military hardware and $7 billion for research and development.

Much of these funds go for the sharply increasing cost of the nation's annual military expenses. The 50 percent increase over several years ago is due to the Viet Nam War.

President Johnson has just called upon Congress to hold appropriations to his budget requests or face a tax rise. The alternate would be a heavy deficit with its impact on inflation.

Next to the Viet Nam War, congressional mail is running highest on the increasing cost of consumer goods. These protests have a persuasive political interest to all House members and the one-third of the Senate up for re-election this Fall.

Heretofore defense spending was sacrosanct. An investigating group under Rep. PORTER HARDY (D.-Va.), of the House Armed Services Committee has just opened hearings on duplication and wasteful defense spending. Special attention is being given to the Pentagon's highly publicized claims of savings on contractual policies.

Rep. GEORGE M. MAHON (D.-Texas), chairman of both the House Appropriation Committee and Joint Committee to reduce Federal spending, has called upon Sec. of Defense Robert S. McMamara to save on "less glamorous items that do not have page one appeal."

He is particularly anxious that the heavy overhead costs of defense contractors now allowed by the Pentagon be cut drastically.

Open Letter From Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Opelika Daily News, July 26, 1966]

OPEN LETTER FROM CHICAGO

Paul Harvey, who writes a nationally syndicated newspaper column appearing in many newspapers three times a week, had a column last week entitled "Open Letter From Chicago."

The column pinpointed some thoughts which have been in the minds of many from this section of the nation but words we seldom see in the columns of nationally syndicated columnists. We wonder how many of his newspaper clients in other areas of the nation used this one? Here is what Harvey had to say in his July 19 "Paul Harvey News:"

"Dear Dixie:

"Can you possibly find it in your heart to accept our sincere apology? When there was race rioting in Little Rock, Arkansas, we were convinced that the cause was callousness. Our public officials and our press in Chicago insisted that the only two reasons for Negro restiveness were your segregated schools and your stubborn governor. We in Chicago, with integrated schools and a very liberal governor are now writhing in the agony of race rioting. And as we seek to set our house in order, we hope your headlines will be kinder to us than ours were to you.

"And when a Mississippi Negro boy was found drowned, we in Chicago called this the "inevitable result of a white-supremacy tradition." Now a Negro girl, 14 and pregnant, has been shot to death on the front porch of her own Home in Chicago—and we are confused and ashamed—and frightened.

"What are we doing wrong that has made eight square miles of our city a battleground? Help us, if you can find it in your own hurt heart to help.

"And Alabama, when your state police were photographed subduing rioters with night sticks, Chicago's bold-face front pages condemned you for "indefensible brutality." Now Illinois State Police have resorted to armored cars and cracking skulls and shooting to kill * * *

"Your governor has alleged that 'Communists are fomenting this strife.' We scoffed.

"Now 13 Negroes on Chicago's West Side have been charged with plotting treason. We are sweeping admittedly Communist literature from our littered streets.

"Forgive us for not knowing what we were talking about.

"Georgia: When you were photographed in the act of turning back crowds of marching children—we could not control ourselves. 'The very idea,' the Chicago press editorialized, 'that youngsters should be considered a menace sufficient to justify the use of tear gas!'

"Now, in our own asphalt jungle, we have seen Negro youngsters of 9, 10, 11—advance on police with drawn guns or broken bottles—screaming, "Kill Whitey!'

"And we used gas and clubs and dogs and guns and, God forgive us, what else could we do! Can you, Georgia, forgive us, too?

"We tried the patience we had preached. Honest, we did. We tried so desperately that seven policemen were shot the other night, two of them through the back. So, in the end, we resorted to methods more brutal than yours. But, don't you see, we had to!

"And our mayor listened to the Negroes' leaders, as he so often admonished you to do. He had listened, he had made compromises and concessions and he had offered sacrificial police officials and school officials—but they kept coming from so many directions with so many demands—and then—demanding to keep the fire hydrants gushing for their playing children during the city's most critical drought—

"Dear Dixie, perhaps we have not yet learned fully to appreciate what you have been trying to do to effect evolution without revolution—but for whatever belated comfort it may be, from our glass house we will not be throwing any more stones at you * * * * * * for a while."

Conditions for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the Wyoming Eagle reflects the widespread feeling that in his recent speech on Asian policy President Johnson spelled out in terms that can be understood by the Communists—and the rest of the world—this country's position and aims.

This is so, the newspaper declares editorially, regardless of doubt that the thinking of Red China's current leaders is likely to change.

The Eagle recounts the President's appeals for a peace of reconciliation in Asia and his outline of essential conditions for peace.

Because of the broad interest in the President's statement of policy, I offer this editorial for the RECORD:

ESSENTIAL CONDITIONS

President Johnson has officially declared a "firm but flexible" U.S. policy toward Communist China—firm against aggression but flexible if China ends its expansionist ambitions in Southeast Asia.

In a major statement on China, Tuesday evening, the President told Red China's rulers that "cooperation, not hostility, is the way of the future." He urged them to renounce aggressive designs and to open their vast country's gates to the outside world.

He appealed for peaceful coexistence as the best hope for a peaceful, prosperous Asia.

The President spoke at a time when Red China was undergoing a political purge, apparently centering around its ideological dispute with Russia's emergent policy of peaceful economic and cultural coexistence with the West.

The President outlined four essential conditions for peace in Asia.

The most difficult, he said, is "reconciliation between nations that now call themselves enemies." Newsmen interpreted this as an obvious reference to China.

The other "essential conditions" outlined by the President were:

The determination of the United States to meet its obligations in Asia as a Pacific power.

To prove to aggressive nations that the use of force to conquer others is a losing game.

The building of political and economic strength among the nations of free Asia.

As far as Viet Nam is concerned, the President repeated assurances that the United States is not trying to destroy North Viet Nam, change its government, establish permanent bases in South Viet Nam, nor "gain one inch of new territory."

However, he warned that as long as aggression persists, the United States will fight.

It is doubtful the President's statement will go far toward changing the thinking of current Communist leaders in Peking.

But it did spell out, in terms that can be understood by the Communists, as well as the rest of the world, this nation's position and aims.

Pending Disaster Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a comparative chart used in my testimony before the Subcommittee on Flood Control for omnibus disaster relief legislation on July 19, 1966.

This chart is helpful in showing how new omnibus disaster relief legislation—S. 1861—would expand the present laws providing relief to disaster victims while also adding authority to give relief in areas not previously covered by the law.

"Omnibus" disaster relief legislation—Its need [1]—S. 1861 and related bills

Agency or assistance	Present law	"Omnibus" new authority
Rural Electrification Administration	7 U.S.C. 912: Has authority to extend time of interest payment.	Sec. 3(a): Specifies loan maturity extended to 40 years.
	Loan adjustments only in case of property damage	Sec. 3(a): Secretary of Agriculture to make loan adjustments in case of damage to "economic feasibility" of a system.
Housing and Home Finance Administration.	No moratorium provision	Sec. 3(b): Moratorium on loan repayments up to 5 years.
	12 U.S.C. 1703(c), 1709, 1715: Commissioner has authority to refinance mortgages.	Sec. 3(b): Maturity of loans extended specifically to 40 years.
		Sec. 3(b): May reduce loan interest rate to 3 percent.
Veterans' Administration	No moratorium on loan repayments	Sec. 3(f): Moratorium on loan repayments up to 5 years.
	38 U.S.C. 1820(a)(2): Agency has discretion to reduce interest rate and maturity of loans.	Sec. 3(f): Reduction of interest rates specified at rate not less than 3 percent per annum and maturity specified at 40 years.
Small Business Administration	15 U.S.C. 636(a)(1): No loans shall be made unless capital is not available from private sources.	Sec. 3(d): Waives need to inquire first about financial assistance from private sources in case of homeowner; limit is $30,000 and in case of business concern, $100,000.
	7 U.S.C. 1922: Section of Agriculture shall not make loans to eligible persons under the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration unless they cannot secure credit elsewhere.	Sec. 3(e): Farmers can obtain emergency loan up to $30,000 to repair farm homes or damaged buildings.
Grants to States for assistance to homeowners and businesses (entirely new approach to disaster relief).	No comparable provision	Sec. 4(b): New cost-sharing plan—Federal Government gives grants to States leaving authority to develop and administer relief programs up to the State. Sec. 4(b): President authorized to make grants up to 50 percent of cost of developing State program (with ceiling of $250,000). Sec. 4(b): Homeowners and businesses must assume 25 percent of property loss and Federal Government 50 percent if property loss exceeds $100. Sec. 4(c): Limits jointly shared losses to $30,000 in case of homeowner and $100,000 in case of businesses.
Shelter for disaster victims	72 U.S.C. 1855(b): Authorizes Federal agencies to provide temporary housing or other emegency shelter for families displaced by major disaster.	Sec. 5: Specifically authorizes the provision of dwelling accommodations, including mobile homes, for displaced persons for a period of up to 12 months at a rental which may not exceed 25 percent of the person's or family's income.
Federal Housing Administration: Insured disaster loans.	12 U.S.C. 1715: Provides assistance to private enterprise to provide homeownership for families of moderate income and low income, who are displaced by reason of governmental action in urban renewal.	Sec. 6: Extends coverage to permit the Federal Housing Administration to insure loans to be secured by mortgage on property serving families displaced by major disaster.
Assistance to farmers	42 U.S.C. 1855(b): Authorizes Federal agencies in any major disaster to offer assistance in clearing debris and wreckage and in rehabilitating farmlands.	Sec. 7: Grants additional authority to a Secretary of Agriculture to make grants equal ⅔ of loss, but not in excess of $10,000 for same purposes stated in law; also includes grants to replace livestock.
Assistance to unincorporated communities—New provision.	42 U.S.C. 1855(b): Provides that assistance be made available to State and local governments.	Sec. 9: Amends provision to include rural communities and unincorporated towns and villages.
Elementary and secondary school assistance.	([2])	([2]).
Highway assistance in disaster areas	23 U.S.C. 812: Federal share for repair and reconstruction of Federal-aid highways not to exceed 50 percent of cost.	Sec. 11: Increases Federal share payable to 100 percent of cost.
	22 U.S.C. 125(a): Emergency relief fund for repair and reconstruction of Federal-aid highways, $30,000,000.	Sec. 11: Increases this fund to $50,000,000.
Priority to certain applications for public facilities and housing assistance.	42 U.S.C. 1491 et seq.: Authorizes loans to municipalities, other political subdivisions, and instrumentalities to finance public works facilities.	Sec. 12: Declares that priority and immediate consideration shall be given to the application for assistance under designated loan programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.
Authorization for public works expenditures.	No comparable provision	Sec. 13: Provides appropriations necessary to repair, restore, or reconstruct any project authorized by an act of Congress which is completed or under construction.
	23 U.S.C. 125: Establishes emergency relief fund for repair or reconstruction of Federal-aid highway system.	Sec. 13: Extends aid to highways, bridges which were not constructed under existing programs; in other words, those that aren't Federal-aid highways.

---

[1] All public law citations available in study by Library of Congress: "Analysis and Comparison of H.R. 9885, 89th Congress With Present Code Provisions."

[2] No need to include provision since Public Law 89-313 covers this area.

Watershed Projects Jeopardized by Power Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the executive branch is attempting to wrest control over watershed projects from Congress so they can be dealt out on a political basis. In the process, more than 55 much-needed projects are being held up by the Bureau of the Budget.

The backlog is growing and is certain to delay action on several South Dakota projects now in the planning stage.

The Bureau of the Budget is delaying the projects because the current law reserves control over the projects to Congress, but the administration wants to seize control and is challenging the legality and constitutionality of the present provision.

Congress has handled these projects for over 12 years and during that time has approved more than 400 watershed projects. Now, in an attempt to corral greater power and authority, the President is stopping these projects.

This deplorable action demonstrates once again that the administration's interest in the farmer is second to the real interest of manipulation of government for political advantage and power.

ZIP Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a significant public service contribution by a major industry has recently been brought to my attention. During the past 2 years, the Magazine Publishers Association, through their President John K. Herbert, has embarked upon a praiseworthy program to assist the Post Office Department in promoting public awareness of the need for and advantages of use of the ZIP code in their mail. In this program, the member magazines of the Magazine Publishers Association contributed 1 billion page impressions of ZIP code advertising having a value of almost one-half million dollars priced at current advertising rates. The association plans to continue these advertisements during the coming year.

I am sure that many Members of Congress have seen the ads in a variety of magazines included in the broad spectrum of the 300 leading Nation's magazines belonging to the Magazine Publishers Association. The ads, designed by the association after consultation with the Post Office Department, have undoubtedly made a significant number of Americans aware of the value and need for the ZIP code program and illustrated the accomplishments that can be achieved by cooperation between industry and Government.

I wanted my fellow Members to be aware of this splendid public service program so that they might join me in expressing our thanks to the members of the Magazine Publishers Association. The Postmaster General is aware of this significant contribution and has expressed his appreciation to magazine publishers for their contribution to the success of the ZIP code program.

The members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives have spent many hours working with the Post Office Department and mailers on the ZIP code program, and it is most gratifying to find such cooperation among a major mail user organization.

IRS and the Grand Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, action by the Internal Revenue Service has threatened to block exposition of conversation groups' views on the proposed Grand Canyon dams.

The appearance early this week of an advertisement in the New York Times, sponsored by the Sierra Club and presenting the reasons for the club's opposition to the Grand Canyon dams, is an encouraging sign.

Discriminatory action by the Internal Revenue Service has failed to stop the defense of Grand Canyon, and I am glad of it.

An editorial in the Idaho Statesman of June 14, 1966, raises the question of whether the IRS action may result, in effect, in taxation of free speech:

The "Club" Over Tax-Exempt Organizations

A provision in the Internal Revenue Code pertaining to tax-exempt organizations prohibits such groups from attempting to influence legislation. If they take political action, the Internal Revenue Service is charged with enforcing the law and withdrawing the tax-exemption status.

It is assumed that federal agents investigate organizations before granting such status in the first place. However, the procedures they entertain in removing organizations from tax-exempt classifications may be questionable.

As an example, the Sierra Club, a California-based organization which promotes studies and programs on preservation of wilderness and national scenic monuments, has a public record of intervening in conservation acts, such as wilderness, wild rivers, seashore, redwood forest preservation and preventing damage to certain national scenic monuments.

Last Thursday, the club placed ads in the New York Times and Washington Post, recruiting public opposition to the construction of two federal reclamation dams in the Grand Canyon as now proposed in Congress. Twenty-four hours later the Internal Revenue Service issued a summons to the club declaring its advertising was an attempt to influence Congress. Thus the club is to lose its tax-exempt status, unless a hearing produces a different interpretation.

There is no intent here to argue the pros or cons of the Sierra Club's stand on the Grand Canyon project.

But if the IRS grants tax-exemption, knowing the purpose of an organization—religious, charitable, public service, political, business or conservation—is to comment and stir opinion on public issues, has the government the right to take away such a status because of influential and capricious complaints from opposing interests.

The law must not be enforced by "shotgun" tactics.

Most prized in this nation is the ability of the people to speak out and organize to protest or support various actions of government.

This is the service the Sierra Club and other foundations perform. If the IRS holds a club over their activities and threatens, possibly the law should be changed to provide that a modest tax be imposed. If any organization operates commercially in competition with private business or holds income property, then it should be taxed in a comparable manner to assessment of private interests.

As it is now, the IRS code can be unjustly enforced on groups which have taken position on public matters, while allowing other organizations to continue without punishment.

Congress should inquire into the intent of the tax-exempt law and whether it is being administered fairly or not, or whether free speech is being taxed.

Arabs To Fight Against American Troops in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY recently spoke before the American Jewish Press Association here in Washington and during the course of his address pointed out that American tax dollars are going to support the members of an Arab army being organized to fight against Israel and whose officers are being sent to Vietnam to fight against our troops as training for an eventual attack upon Israel.

This incredible story is reported editorially in the July–August 1966 edition of the National Jewish Monthly and I commend that editorial to the attention of our colleagues:

Arabs We Are Feeding Are Preparing To Kill Americans in Viet Nam and To Invade Israel

To the overwhelming majorty of our readers, who are American citizens, we address this question: Are you aware that part of your tax money is now being used to support men who are in an army that is openly preparing to fight against Americans in Viet Nam and later attack the State of Israel?

This shocking statement is literally true. The army referred to is the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization (P.L.O.), which the notorious Arab opportunist Ahmad Shukairy has formed with Arab refugees from Palestine. That army is receiving weapons from Communist China, and some of its officers are being sent to North Viet Nam to fight against the Americans defending South Viet Nam—and at the same time to receive training in guerrilla warfare, to be applied later against Israel. These soldiers in the P.L.O., and their families, are living in the Arab refugee camps in Egypt and Syria which are supported by the United Nations. And the United States contribution to the support of those camps is 70% of the total.

This is no idle theory; Shukairy himself boasts of it. During the recent annual convention of the American Jewish Press Association in Washington, B'nai B'rith tendered the delegates a reception in the B'nai B'rith Building. Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY was the speaker, and he brought out the facts mentioned above. His remarks were reported to Shukairy, who declared in a speech at a P.L.O. camp in Syria: "The Liberation Army and the P.L.O. are proceeding with determination. We receive arms from the Chinese People's Republic. The P.L.O. has military officers being trained in the arms of liberation and the experience of the Chinese." He added: "We and our army are a threat to Israel." Shukairy, usually unreliable, may be telling the truth now.

THE UN SHOULD STOP SUPPORTING AN ARMY OF AGGRESSORS

The U.S. Government has now urged the UN to remove from its relief rolls all Arab refugees who are involved in such military activities. All we can say to that is: it's about time! Sen. EDWARD KENNEDY heads a Senate subcommittee which has been investigating UN relief activities in general in Egypt, Lebanon, and Jordan, and he has estimated that between 10,000 and 14,000 Arab refugees are in the P.L.O.—all of them receiving food and supplies from the UN. We welcome his demand that they be stricken from the relief rolls. "It is incompatible with United States policy and with the fundamental concept of the United Nations," he declared, "to supply aid in any way to members of any army whose purpose is to work against a member nation of the UN."

We also welcome the action of King Hussein of Jordan, who has banned the P.L.O. in his country. He called it "an extremist group," and was promptly attacked by Egypt and Syria. But the King went even further, and made a statement of the utmost significance: he demanded that all the Arab refugee camps now being maintained by the UN be liquidated, and that those living in them should be integrated in the countries where those camps are located.

This is, of course, the policy which Israel and many leaders in other countries throughout the world have been advocating for years. It just does not make sense—nor is it humanitarian—to keep on maintaining hundreds of thousands of refugees in "temporary" enclaves, supported by the charity of the world—when the vast empty stretches of Arab territories are crying out for manpower to develop them—and especially manpower of their own religious and linguistic kind. King Hussein himself has shown the way; almost half of all the Arab refugees are living in his kingdom, and he has incorporated them into his country. If Egypt and Syria were to do the same, the problem would be solved. But Egypt and Syria have found the "refugee problem" too convenient for their political purposes to do that, so far.

It is now more than 18 years since the Palestine Arabs fled from the new State of Israel, after being told by their leaders that following an Arab victory they could return and seize all the Jewish property for themselves. The intolerable refugee camps should be closed, and their inmates integrated into the countries of their Arab brothers.

That cannot be done overnight. But what can and should be done at once is to remove from the UN relief rolls every Arab refugee who, through the Palestine Liberation Organization, is being supported by American tax dollars while he trains to fight against Americans in Viet Nam and prepares to invade Israel.

Power of Nonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune, in an editorial Monday, July 25, very properly noted the passing of Konrad Heiden, and their very appropriate editorial with its fascinating historical recollection attracted my attention. I would therefore like to include it in the Record at this point.

Power of Nonsense

Konrad Heiden was so early an anti-nazi publicist that his first book, "History of National Socialism" [1932], was published in Germany and publicly burned by Nazis there before Hitler's party came to power. Heiden's death in New York the other day has reminded the public that it was he who first popularized the term Nazi, in place of the earlier current Naso.

The expression "National Socialist" was naturally first abbreviated to the first two letters in each of the two words—Naso. As a satiric thrust, Heiden preferred to use the first four letters in the German word meaning "national," as in Bavarian slang *Nazi* had the established meaning of "bumpkin" or "simpleton." Some say that the Nasos quickly adopted the term *Nazi*, successfully seeking by their acceptance of the word to blur the bite it had in Heiden's first use of it.

In writing of Hitler's speeches, which he heard as early as 1920, Heiden said they impressed him as a "flood of nonsense."

The Trial of American Fliers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed welcome news that the regime in North Vietnam has reconsidered its previously announced intentions to try American pilots shot down over their territory as war criminals.

Such a step would have produced an increase of tensions and probably escalation of the war itself. The execution of American fliers, as the Milwaukee Journal said in a recent editorial, would be a "calamity."

The Journal pointed out that the restraint which has marked the conflict thus far might be snapped by such trials and executions. For that reason, such actions not only would violate international law on the treatment of prisoners, but also would imperial world peace.

At this point I wish to insert in the Record the thoughtful comments of the newspaper's editorial:

Trial of American Fliers Certain To Escalate War

Captured and handcuffed United States airmen have been paraded through the streets of Hanoi under armed guard and through hostile crowds. Now North Vietnam has threatened to try the airmen as criminals for participating in bombings which killed North Vietnam citizens. Hanoi reportedly feels that the Americans are not prisoners of war because there has been no declaration of war.

Vicious as this undeclared war is, the mass trial and execution of American flyers would be a calamity. "We have had many tragic miscalculations on both sides in this war," columnist James Reston declared, "but none more ominous or dangerous than this."

International agreement on treatment of prisoners of war, such as it is, has evolved painfully. Article 2 of the Geneva convention of 1929 declared that war prisoners "must at all times be humanely treated and protected, particularly against acts of violence, insults and public curiosity. Measures of reprisal against them are prohibited." The United States ratified the convention in 1932. Russia, Communist China and North Vietnam have never signed it.

The 1949 Geneva convention, signed by 61 nations including the United States, specifically provides that war prisoners be protected against intimidation and reprisal for acts of war performed in the line of duty. And it forbids reprisals against prisoners in "all cases of declared war or any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the high contracting parties, even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them." Among the signers was North Vietnam. The date: June 5, 1957.

The history of this conflict is ugly enough already. At least one American prisoner of war has been murdered by the Vietcong. There also have been published reports of atrocities, some against prisoners of war, by the South Vietnamese.

This is no polite gentleman's game covered by polite rules. The only rules observed at all are those imposed by the fear that if one side breaks them, the other will retaliate and thus escalate brutality with more brutality.

It would be disastrous if this slender thread of sanity in the midst of war should be snapped by the trial and execution of American airmen, or of any prisoners of war on either side. It could result in an even more ominous threat to the peace of the whole world.

New Mexico Democrats Oppose Grand Canyon Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Grand Canyon dam proposal resembles a steamroller in the way it has responded to opposition.

For this reason it is particularly significant when people in the Colorado River Basin raise their voices against the proposed Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams.

The New Mexico State Democratic Party recently took a stand in opposition to the dams and in support of national park status for the entire Grand Canyon.

About the dams they say:

> Particularly we oppose construction of any dams on the Colorado River within the Grand Canyon Area between Lee's Ferry and Lake Mead.

I submit for inclusion in the Record the text of the resolution adopted by the New Mexico Democrats at their convention on July 16, 1966:

Be it resolved, That the New Mexico Congressional delegation explore all possibilities of providing electric power to the Central Arizona Project and that the members of the delegation seek all alternates to the building of large multi-purpose dams which would deface or destroy the beauty of the Grand Canyon, particularly we oppose construction of any dams on the Colorado River within the Grand Canyon Area between Lee's Ferry and Lake Mead. This specifically concerns the present congressional legislation for Marble Gorge and Bridge Canyon (Walapi) dams.

We support giving National Park status or its equivalent to the entire Grand Canyon.

Right or Wrong, the Readers Always Write

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, July 6, in the Daily Olympian is a letter written by a very articulate and thoughtful man in my district which expresses the thoughts, spirit, and decency of a sizable number of people in my district.

It is a distinct pleasure to place this in the Record today so that others may have the opportunity of reading his message.

May I particularly call attention to the last paragraph:

Right or Wrong, the Readers Always Write: Whose Rights?

Editor, the Daily Olympian:

I am angered, nowadays, every time I hear the word "rights." Whose rights? The rights of a tiny minority to scorn, abuse, and undermine the welfare, peace, and safety of the vast majority?

This nation was founded on a Bill of Rights, but those rights were, and are, designed to protect the majority and the nation as well as the individual or the few. When the sometimes mistaken, often deliberate, assertion of so-called "rights" by a comparatively small minority take away from the large majority of our citizenry the latter's own rights—just whose "rights" are we talking about?

Is it too "reactionary" to say that the youth of America have the right to peaceably and orderly attend our universities without being obstructed, annoyed, and insulted by a few protesting, obscene malcontents—who contribute nothing to the national welfare? Many, not students at all, but merely idle agitators. Is it too much to say that the average American has the right to traverse our streets without the hazard of riots and lethal lawlessness on the part of those who seek to take the law into their own hands under the pretense of fighting for some assumed right?

How long must we stand idly by and see our police, whom we empower to maintain law and order, attacked, abused, undermined and ridiculed by the criminal few, and those who choose to prostitute the meaning of the word rights? Our Supreme Court recently split 5 to 4 in deciding the "rights" of the criminal suspect and the resulting decision brought the strong protest of the minority judges as well as the near complete dismay of a very sizeable segment of our law enforcement agencies.

Just how far ARE we going to carry this "rights" thing? Exactly whose rights are of primary importance—those of the criminal few, or those of our vast majority of law abiding citizens? If we render our law enforcement agencies powerless to maintain peace and order; if the average citizen is thereby not safe in his home or on the streets via this mistaken, overzealous witch-hunt towards over liberality in protection of dubious "rights" of the lawless few—isn't it about time that we decide whose and what rights are paramount? Are the rights of our very vast majority—unprotesting, peaceable, ordinary citizens—so obscure that these can be dismissed, overlooked, or trod upon by a relative few who choose to riot, burn, obstruct, loot, and abuse at will under the fictiticious claim of so-called pro-

> test in fuzzy assertion of deprivation of something they call their rights?
>
> This nation, as all others, has its faults, ills and limitations. But, I am one of those of our great majority who still believes that it is still the finest and the greatest on earth. It is not the protesting student, the beatnik, or those who riot, kill, maim, or destroy who make this country great. It is the faithful, too patient, mostly quiet everyday wage earner, the young men defending and dying for our nation abroad, the doctor, the scientist, and millions of others far too busy to agitate about imaginary rights. How long, oh how long must it be before our Congress and our over-patient people become concerned and act? Does not the majority, too, have rights?
>
> Kenneth McClarty.

American Automobile Association Urges Respect for the Country's National Shrines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Congressional Record of June 30 at page 14249, I called attention to the failure to observe decorum and propriety at Arlington Cemetery where we honor our dead. My correspondence on this is set forth in the Congressional Record of July 18 at page 15167.

The American Automobile Association has performed a public service by joining in urging respect for the country's national shrines. Their statement follows:

> The ugly American—the tourist who visits the Nation's shrines, churches and monuments dressed as if he were attending a picnic—is becoming of increasing concern to the travel industry.
>
> The problem was pointed up in a letter received recently by the American Automobile Association from an interesting church for visitors in the mid-West:
>
> "Because our church is listed in your (tour) book as one of the points of interest which tourists might visit," the letter said, in part, "we have been inundated with travelers in all forms of dress. Consequently, we have been unable to maintain the reverential mood and spirit which should prevail in our Sanctuary.
>
> "Hence, we are earnestly requesting at this time that any information pertaining to the (church) which is contained in any of your publications be deleted."
>
> The problem is particularly acute in the Nation's Capital. AAA's Mideastern Tour Book, which covers the Washington, D.C., area, offers these hints:
>
> "There is increased local feeling in both government and civic circles concerning the mode of dress of tourists in Washington, D.C. We cannot expect others to respect the shrines and institutions which comprise this city if we, ourselves, do not treat them with dignity.
>
> "Our garb, as do our manners, directly reflects our esteem for our national heritage. The many 'miracle' fabrics make it possible to dress tastefully as well as comfortably and thereby relegate the slacks and shorts from the buildings of the Nation's Capital to their place at home or in a resort."
>
> In a recent letter to Arlington National Cemetery officials, Representative Theodore R. Kupferman of New York voiced similar views when he said he was appalled to see visitors to the cemetery wearing "attire more suitable to a public amusement park or beach."
>
> He asked that a policy be established requiring visitors to dress in a manner "conforming to the propriety of the occasion."
>
> The Congressman continued:
>
> "Arlington is not a public park; it is a sanctuary and final resting place for many of those who died in the service of their country. The dress of tourists is particularly disturbing to me because they also visit the gravesite of President John F. Kennedy dressed as if they were going on a picnic."

Gemini 10 Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the triumph of Astronauts Young and Collins in Gemini 10 has implications that extend beyond the science of space itself.

Some of them are suggested by the Watertown Daily Times.

Once again, the newspaper comments editorially, the mind and body of man have demonstrated what brilliance and discipline can accomplish. They also have demonstrated that fear born of ignorance can be overcome by those who prepare themselves through training and perseverance.

The New York newspaper adds that all of us might well consider that we can accomplish—individually and together—as much as the astronauts if we prepare ourselves with dedication and belief in something new and better.

I place this editorial in the Record:

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, July 22, 1966]

THE GEMINI-10 TRIUMPH

> The successful Gemini-10 flight is a thrilling and happy piece of news amidst the distressing events of recent weeks. The mission of Commander John W. Young and Major Michael Collins has a bigger place in world affairs than being merely an offset of bad news, but their expedition came at a time when Americans were desirous of seeing something highly constructive in moments when so many events were destructive.
>
> We congratulate Commander Young and Major Collins and thank them for what they have done in our behalf during the last few days.
>
> What an accomplishment the Gemini flight is. The two astronauts went into outer space effortlessly and with an efficiency that epitomizes the brilliant preparations by the manned space flight leaders. They stayed aloft for 71 hours. They joined the Agenda rocket which was circling in space waiting for them. They also joined Gemini-8's Agena for a second rendezvous. There was no actual link-up, but the proximity of the devices was such as to amount to the same thing. Major Collins made a lengthy walk in space on two occasions. He made physical observations and inspections of the Gemini-8 Agena.
>
> Their achievements may have passed the category of the heroic in view of the fact that many men have been their predecessors in space. Yet this mission this week is the one that added the unglamorous technical detail. Others pioneered. This pair of astronauts had a workhorse assignment, the kind that clarifies the detail of the previous missions and establishes the basic data for future trips.
>
> The mind and the body of man have demonstrated once again what brilliance and discipline can accomplish. They have also demonstrated once again that fear born out of ignorance is overcome by those who will prepare themselves through training and perseverance in learning.
>
> The nation is proud of them and its citizens might well consider that they can accomplish individually and together as much as the astronauts if they will prepare themselves with dedication and belief in something new and better.

Flag Desecration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased that my hometown newspaper, the Kingsport, Tenn., Times has given wholehearted endorsement to the bill, which I and a number of my colleagues have introduced, to prohibit the desecration of our flag.

This bill has received the approval of many papers in my district, and I again urge that it be considered during this session of the Congress.

FLAG DESECRATION

> When it comes to silly arguments, about the silliest to come to our attention in a long time is the one that the proposal of a federal law to bid for and punish desecration of the American Flag might "violate the constitutional guarantee of free speech."
>
> Any member of the Congress entertaining such a theory, as ground for legal objection, is fabricating his own gnat to strain at. There may be a relationship between words and actions of infamy—as between cause and effect—but they are not legally one and the same thing.
>
> Technically, and in the eyes of the law, there is a difference between saying "Let's burn the house down," and seting fire to it.
>
> The Flag has been desecrated time and again this era of rampant holliganism and apparently privileged seditious mischief. Subversive characters have spat on it, walked on it, burned it and torn it to shreds. They thereby were showing contempt not only for Old Glory, but for the thousands of young Americans who are fighting and dying for it.
>
> Yet with a spate of measures before Congress to make that offense a federal crime, there still is no national law against it. The culprits go free!
>
> For postage stamp irregularity you can go to jail. For mutilating money, penalty attaches—and nobody arises (or should) to suggest that punishment infringes the offender's "right" to talk himself blue (or Red) in the face.
>
> The law proposed—and co-sponsored by our own Congressman Jimmy Quillen—is eminently in order. One with teeth should be enacted and enforced to the letter.

Legal Services for the Poor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star gives us a report on progress made in various parts of the country under one of the more innovative projects of the war on poverty—that of providing free legal representation for the poor.

Already, the Star says, 160 legal services programs have been established in urban and rural areas.

The newspaper's Supreme Court reporter, Dana Bullen, writes that the most interesting part of the undertaking is an experimental "judicare" program for 27 counties in northern Wisconsin. With this plan, which is to be tested in other places, credit cards are issued to the poor, entitling them to legal services from participating attorneys.

This program not only makes the best attorneys in each community available to fight the individual legal battles of the poor, but it also involves them, as community leaders, in the problems of the poor. Thus, the program is designed to give not only the individual poor a representative in court, but also a spokesman in community and legislative councils.

This report on an expanding project may be of interest to many of my colleagues, so I include it in the RECORD:

"JUDICARE" PROGRAM FOR THE POOR

(By Dana Bullen)

An innovative and sometimes misunderstood new federal program to provide free lawyers for poor people is mushrooming across the country as part of the Johnson administration's war on poverty.

Partly it is a response to the idea that a poor person in a Watts or a Harlem who can take his gripe to an attorney is that much less likely to heave a brick through somebody's glass window.

But this is not the whole goal of the Office of Economic Opportunity's legal services program. More deeply the program seeks to write what Sargent Shriver, the poverty war chief, calls "A new Bill of Rights" for the poor.

During the fiscal year that ended last month, about $25 million was committed to the task. Already 160 legal services programs are under way in cities and rural areas across the nation. All but four of the 50 largest cities in the country have a program at some stage. More money is being sought for next year.

The main thrust of the programs is representation in civil rather than criminal cases.

Like it or not, in today's world a person often needs a lawyer to get a fair shake from big business, big government or big anything. And to a poor person, almost anybody seems big.

The low income couple who signs a note for $400 plus another $100 in interest on a TV set worth at most $190, for example, would have an almost impossible time getting the merchant to back down without a lawyer.

Consumer complaints are just the beginning, though. Every city has a mountain of simmering housing, welfare and similar problems, and the complaints in rural settings are no less acute.

So with programs strung out from big city slums to migrant farm workers camps, the poverty lawyers are innovating. With a mixture of hope and fear, private lawyers are watching the developments.

In big cities, poverty law offices in the slums seem to be the answer. An office is open in Watts and more are coming. A program for Harlem will be under way soon. In Washington, neighborhood legal services offices handled 10,000 cases in the last year and a half.

One of the Washington cases already has led to a lower court ruling holding unconstitutional "retaliatory evictions" of tenants who complain to authorities about a landlord's housing code violations.

For rural areas, strings of branch law offices and circuit-riding attorneys are being tried. Both California and Florida have big migrant farm worker programs getting under way.

The most interesting project, however, is an experimental "Judicare" plan for 27 sparsely-populated counties of Northern Wisconsin.

Under the plan, to be tested in several other places too, poor people will receive credit cards entitling them to free legal services from participating lawyers. The attorney will get 80 percent of the accepted local minimum fee for the service performed.

The sparsely populated site was picked by OEO for the first "Judicare" experiment because a central law office seemed impractical there and because the experiment could not get too far out of hand.

Another closely-watched project is starting at the University of Mississippi law school. Some 100 law students there will assist staff lawyers in Jackson. In addition to case-by-case legal business, the office is expected to help poor people set up credit unions, agricultural cooperatives and similar organizations.

"The legal services program in Mississippi can be a catalyst in a state that very much needs it," an OEO staff member told an advisory committee recently.

The problem with catalysts, however, is that those who are being moved sometimes do not like it. Although the legal services program thus far has escaped great controversy, there is no telling what lies ahead.

A year and a half ago, national leaders of the organized bar took a hard look at the bruising the medical profession took in unsuccessfully opposing medicare. They then lined up in support of the poverty war legal services program.

Legal aid had been a bar project for years, they decided, and a "properly implemented" OEO program would be a good thing. Everybody agreed there was plenty of charity work nobody was taking care of.

But some private lawyers still feel the poverty attorneys will cut into their fee-paying business. This fear played a part in the decision by North Dakota's governor last spring to veto two OEO law programs for his state.

In most states, however, the demand for legal services grants is growing every day. In fact the prospect now is that Congress will be under new pressure to give the program a larger role.

Gains Behind Our Shield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. In his recent speech on Asian policy, the Waco News Tribune says, President Johnson advanced a positive position to which all reasonable men can adhere.

The newspaper describes the President's statement of policy as a "great speech," telling Asians that if hostility is laid aside, they can see the beginning of a new era of prosperity.

Most encouraging, in the Waco paper's view, was the President's recital of economic and political gains made by free nations of Asia behind the shield of American power.

This is further vindication of our stand in Vietnam—and Korea and Taiwan—the newspaper declares.

I request that its editorial on the subject be included in the RECORD:

BEHIND OUR SHIELD, ASIA BEGINNING TO MAKE GAINS

President Johnson's televised address Tuesday evening ostensibly was directed to the convention of the American Alumni Council but actually he spoke bluntly to the Communist regimes in North Viet Nam and China.

By our standards of right and reason, Mr. Johnson presented the leaders of Asia a logical, sensible prospect, if only they would agree to stop the use of force against their neighbors and permit free exchange of ideas, persons and goods across their borders.

It would be a miracle indeed if the Communists anywhere accepted the Johnson thesis. Realism is beyond their imaginations. But as president of the free world's most powerful nation, Mr. Johnson must continue as did his predecessors, to advance a positive position to which all reasonable peoples can adhere.

Mr. Johnson gave the Communists a choice . . . continue to fight the armed might of the allied nations or call off aggression and join in building a better world. It would be unfortunate if the warped, myopic viewpoints in Hanoi and Peking took his words as a sign of weakness or irresolution.

It is possible that Mr. Johnson timed his speech for possible effect inside China where a half-hidden struggle for power has been shaking the highest ranks of the ruling clique. This can only be speculated about but it has its intriguing aspects.

The most encouraging part of the President's address dealt with the economic and political gains being made by the free nations of Asia behind the shield of American military power. This is further vindication of our stand in Viet Nam . . . and Korea and Taiwan. The latter two nations are becoming showcases of progress in the Far East, behind the shield of the Stars and Stripes.

The United States is a Pacific power. Its vital interests on the far side of that ocean demand that no hostile force be allowed to grow that would menace our shores. The message of the President of the United States is that if hostility is laid aside, a great era of prosperity can begin for more than a billion people. It was a great speech, delivered well.

Charles S. Murphy: 30 Years of Dedicated Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 31, Charles S. Murphy, the Civil Aeronautics Board Chairman, completes 30 years of distinguished service in the Federal Government.

Most of us in the Congress know Charley Murphy, and I am sure that I voice a universal sentiment in saluting him on this anniversary of his accomplishments and express to him the gratitude of all of us who are interested in good government.

In noting the progress of his career, I have spoken of Charley in this House on other occasions. I have mentioned that he was born lucky, and that this is the common fortune of all who are born in North Carolina and who have parents of sturdy stock to guide them in their tender years.

Mr. Speaker, three Presidents have recognized the varied and seemingly unlimited abilities of this North Carolinian.

He is typical of those public servants who create respect for our democratic system. He is typical of those dedicated people who by their ability, integrity, and devotion to duty, keep the wheels of government turning.

President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed Mr. Murphy to the CAB on June 1, 1965. Prior to this he had served as Under Secretary of Agriculture for more than 4 years, this appointment having been made by the late President John F. Kennedy shortly after his inauguration.

In 1947, after many years service in the office of the legislative counsel of the U.S. Senate, Mr. Murphy became administrative assistant to President Harry S. Truman, and in 1950 was advanced to the position of special counsel to the President.

Following graduation from Duke University's School of Law in 1934, he received an appointment as law assistant in the office of the Senate legislative counsel. He served in this post 2 years when he was selected as assistant legislative counsel to the Senate, a position held 11 years. As a legislative draftsman he worked with Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives in writing numerous pieces of legislation, including the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Many of its provisions have been carried forward into the Federal Aviation Act, which today governs aviation in the United States and which Mr. Murphy, as CAB Chairman, now helps administer.

It was while on the Senate staff that Mr. Murphy was selected by President Truman to serve as administrative assistant and later special counsel in the White House.

From 1953 to 1961, Mr. Murphy practiced law as a member of the Washington, D.C., firm of Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams. From 1957 to 1960, he was counsel to the Democratic National Advisory Council.

President Kennedy, immediately after his inauguration January 20, 1961, selected Mr. Murphy as Under Secretary of Agriculture.

As Under Secretary from 1961 to 1965, Mr. Murphy had general supervisory responsibility for all USDA agencies and for the administration of its many widespread programs. He coordinated and reviewed the Department's staff work on many pieces of major legislation. The measures enacted stamp this half decade in the Agriculture Department as one of the most progressive in American history. As President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, he had special responsibility for supervising the commodity programs that broke the back of the mountainous feed grain wheat surpluses. He successfully represented the United States in international discussions on foreign agricultural trade. These discussions played an important part in raising U.S. farm exports to record highs.

Mr. Murphy was sworn in by President Johnson as a CAB member and Board Chairman June 1, 1965. The term ends December 31, 1968.

From 1956 to 1958 Mr. Murphy was president of the National Capital Democratic Club. He belongs to the Order of the Coif, Delta Sigma Phi, Pi Gamma Mu, and Omicron Delta Kappa. He was admitted to the North Carolina Bar in 1934, the Supreme Court bar in 1944, and the District of Columbia bar in 1947.

Mr. Murphy is a member of the American Bar Association, the North Carolina Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association and the District of Columbia Bar Association. Married to the former Kate Chestney Graham, of Durham, they have three children. A daughter, Courtenay, is married to Whitney Slater. A son, Westbrook, a 1965 graduate of Yale University School of Law, is a career government employee in the Justice Department. Another daughter, Betty, lives with her parents in Washington, D.C., and will graduate from high school this June.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation is fortunate to have men like Charley Murphy in Government service. We salute him on his 30th anniversary in this service, and we expect of him even greater achievements in the years ahead.

New Era in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, we are all thrilled by success stories—accounts of the underprivileged who have improved their lot through hard work, forward thinking, perseverance, and ingenuity. Today, I want to relate a success story which deserves national attention.

Earlier this year, the Deposit Guaranty National Bank of Jackson, Miss., sponsored an economic symposium on "The Year Ahead in Mississippi." Leaders in government, agriculture, business, industry, research, finance, and distribution outlined in detail the economic progress of the past few years in Mississippi and the outlook for the future.

The reports of this group of dynamic leaders completely dispel the myth of a backward Mississippi plagued by the pangs of economic despair. Instead, they make it quite clear that a sustained pattern of growth is pushing Mississippi to the forefront in the field of economic development.

The spectacular progress was underscored by Nat S. Rogers, Deposit Guaranty National Bank president, who pointed out, for instance, that during the past decade total resources of Mississippi banks increased by more than $1 billion, or over 107 percent, while the average increase for the Nation was approximately 60 percent. Last year, he noted for the first time total deposits of all banks in the State exceeded $2 billion, total loans exceeded $1 billion, and total capital accounts passed the $150 million mark.

The new vitality is reflected in mushrooming industrial development which has broken all previous records in the State during the past 2 years. More than $385 million in new capital was invested in 275 new and expanded plants which created over 21,000 new job opportunities. Last year alone there were 155 new and expanded plants and over 12,000 new job opportunities.

By last November, it was noted, those gainfully employed in manufacturing reached an all-time record high of 158,300. This was an increase of more than 13,600 over the previous year. Total nonfarm employment soared to a new high of 613,000, an increase of 24,600 over the previous year. These figures assume added significance when we compare them with the growth rate between 1950 and 1961 which showed an increase in manufacturing jobs in Mississippi of an average of just 3,000 annually. From 1961 through 1964, the annual gain averaged 7,000 jobs—a rate of increase of 250 percent. This increased manufacturing employment by a healthy 17 percent.

But, Mr. Speaker, our State leaders view this recent economic progress as merely a beginning. Already, imaginative new programs are being initiated to enhance further development and growth. A community revitalization program has been inaugurated to guide our smaller towns and rural communities into activities which will put new pep into their economies and increase local employment. Most significant, perhaps, is a bold new research program under the dynamic leadership of a national authority in this field—Dr. Kenneth C. Wagner. The Mississippi Research and Development Center will provide technical data and produce a flow of feasibility studies which will be used to plan and prepare for a better tomorrow in the State.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a sharp contrast between the vibrant Mississippi of today and the Mississippi of yesteryear when a one-crop economy spelled financial despair and frustration.

The bustling business activity, coupled with diversification in agriculture, is providing spectacular new opportunities in Mississippi. The progress has not been accidental. It is the result of the combined and determined efforts of the business, civic, educational, governmental and religious leadership.

Mississippi and Mississippians are better organized, more knowledgeable and more determined to secure broad economic gains than at any point in history. A continuous flow of fresh ideas and fresh leadership is breaking the barriers that block the path to growth. The effects of this creative energy will be even more evident in the months ahead as Mississippi prepares to enter a new era of unparalleled prosperity.

Let Freedom Ring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN W. DYAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Harry G. Suttner, of Redlands, Calif., who is in my congressional district, has been notified that he has won the Freedoms Foundation Honor Certificate for his July 4, 1965, sermon "Let Freedom Ring." The message of his sermon is timeless. I recommend its reading to the Members of the House.

SERMON: LET FREEDOM RING, JULY 4, 1965

Today, July 4, 1965, America observes her 189th birthday. Looked at in terms of man's life expectancy, it is a long time. Looked at in terms of nations, it is brief. Looked at in terms of human history, it is nothing less than a second on the hourglass of time.

This morning, let us return to those difficult and disturbing days of 1776 when English colonists pushed by a foolish king, a stupid parliament, and an aristocracy that wanted Britishers away from home, to pay for a war in which they had neither interest nor participation, rebelled and demanded separation and free government.

Three years previously in July 1773, Benjamin Franklin made the recommendation that a General Congress convene. The first Congress met in September 1774 and wanted only to find ways and means of recovering "the just rights and liberties" of the Colonists, and the restoration of union and harmony with Great Britain.

The Second Continental Congress met in May 1775, a month after the battles of Lexington and Concord. Neither side had wanted to strike the first blow. But when General Gage seized stores of powder and shot collected by the Colonists, he brought on the war he was trying so hard to prevent.

On the night of April 18, 1775, he sent Major John Pitcairn with a detachment of men to destroy stores at Concord. This was the day—or night—of Paul Revere's famous ride as he and William Dawes rode to warn the countryside that the British troops were coming, and to warn John Hancock and Samuel Adams they were in danger of capture. Pitcairn and his 1000 men marched resolutely on through the night to the accompaniment of church bells and gunfire. Early in the morning of April 19 they met a band of 50 or 60 militiamen on the green at Lexington. Someone fired, a volley followed and 8 militiamen were killed.

Marching on the Concord, the British took the town and destroyed the stores of powder and shot. Here the Redcoats by the rude bridge that arched the flood, felt the full fury of those New England farmers. The entire English detachment withdrew before the fierce attack of these great patriots and returned to Boston.

On June 16, 1775, the Americans proved without any doubt their magnificent courage. What a sight! Drums throbbed in the distance; lines of Redcoats, bayonets glistening, moved swiftly across the green field at the bottom of the hill—Bunker Hill or Breed's Hill. British ships lay angry in the harbor sending shot after shot rolling around the hilltop. High on the summit was a new ridge of dark earth harsh against the soft green of the grass. There is no sound there. Are there patriots there? From Boston everyone watched. From the rooftops they saw flames from the city of Charleston light up the sky. The British are nearing the top of the hill now. In perfect step they form a red line—straight as a die, and still there is no sound from behind the breastworks.

An approaching English soldier cries, "Colonel Abercrombie, O, Colonel Abercrombie, are the Yankees cowards?" The question goes unanswered for now there are voices behind the new earth. Then with the British troops fifteen yards away, blazing guns blast forth. The straight red line falters, stops, then begins to retreat. Dead and wounded lie all around. No one had heard the words of William Prescott. Words that like "nuts" at Bastogne in World War II, made history. "Don't shoot until you see the whites of their eyes!"

You know, that is good advice today. So many of us take ill-advised pot shots at every flash of color on the field. We would-be defenders of freedom have cost the cause of freedom more, than had we kept quiet.

Wounding friend and foe alike, we never seem to learn.

The Patriots at Bunker Hill waited until they were sure of hitting their mark. They held their fire until the time was right to do the most for liberty. Meanwhile the second Continental Congress was doing the same thing. They met in an atmosphere of final purpose and steeled resoluteness.

The Americans had no commander. At this time George Washington was appointed in charge of all troops "raised for the defense of American liberty." The Congress also adopted "A Declaration on the causes and Necessity of Taking up Arms." This Declaration stated "the arms we have been compelled by our enemies to assume, we will employ for the preservation of our liberties, being with one mind resolved to die free men rather than to live slaves."

When the Congress met again in June 1776, a committee was appointed to prepare a Declaration of Independence. The members of that committee were Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman and Philip Livingston. The man chosen by the committee to write the Declaration was Thomas Jefferson, a young man of 33 from Old Shadwell, Va. Gifted in law, farming, philosophy and science, Jefferson was chosen because he had a "happy talent for composition" as well as being a man of sound judgment and tested patriotism.

Jefferson's draft was reported to Congress on June 28. It was laid on the table until July 1. On that day it was debated. The next day, July 2, Congress voted independence but did not act on the Declaration. On July 3rd, it was again considered and on a hot day, the fourth of July, they debated for the last time.

The flies pestered these delegates; bit through thin white stockings, buzzed about the powdered wigs, and the delegates were hot and uncomfortable. But they were purposeful. And they remembered. "Blandishments will not fascinate us, nor will threats of a halter intimidate", said Jonah Quincy in 1774. "For when under God, we are determined that wheresoever, whensoever, or howsoever, we shall be called to make our exit, we will die free men." And: "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains or slavery?" demanded Patrick Henry in 1775. "Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

There were those in the State House in Philadelphia, now Independence Hall, who were unhappy with Jefferson's document. They fought for changes. Yet between the slaps of flies and the bitterness, they adopted the Declaration of Independence. Thirteen weak and disunited states became one. The break with England was complete.

Nobody signed the Declaration on July 4. They only voted to sign it and then got out of town because now they were traitors. There was a price of 500 pounds on the heads of John Hancock and John Adams. A small fortune in those days. They signed a month later, on August 2. Their names were not made public for six months longer in the hope that they could get back safely to their homes, all the way from New Hampshire to Georgia. Some of them never got back during all the years of the war.

George Washington, when he heard of the signing, was encamped near New York and as always, threatened with defeat. But he too, had an unshakeable faith in the future and through prayer asked God to keep the U.S. in His holy protection.

When the Founding Fathers drew up and adopted our Declaration of Independence, they made it unmistakeably clear that God is the very foundation of freedom of "all men."

Jefferson's thoughts are chiseled in stone on his memorial in Washington. "The God who gave us life gave us liberty. Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God?"

To make sure we would remember liberties are the gift of God they deliberately included four significant references to Him. Two at the beginning and two at the end. Have you read it lately? (It's not very long—only 1321 words in all. What words they are! "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Each of us is a child of God with certain unalienable rights. Our fathers took this belief, built upon it and sang about it.

> "My country, tis of thee
> Sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing.
> Land where my father died,
> Land of the pilgrim's pride,
> From every mountain side
> Let freedom ring."

Our fathers took this belief and in the closing sentence of the Declaration Congress made another great profession of trust in God in those compelling words: "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

I had forgotten how many gave their lives until I read a book "They Signed For Us."

John Morton of Pennsylvania died eight months after signing, ostracized by relatives and friends. His dying words were: "Tell them that they will live to see the hour when they shall acknowledge it to have been the most glorious service that I ever rendered to my country."

John Hart of New Jersey found when he returned home that his wife and some of his children had been seized by the British and thrown in a dungeon. He himself, did not live through the war.

"Our fortunes—" I had never known how many gave their fortunes.

Carter Braxton of Virginia lost his fleet of ships, his home, and his personal property.

Lewis Morris of New York, lost his palatial home, cattle, everything, and for six long years he and his family lived in hand-to-mouth poverty.

Thomas Nelson of Virginia, Robert Morris of Pennsylvania, the list is endless.

But today, as Dr. Walter Judd pointed up so graphically, today we say we want peace but mostly, we want to be left in peace so that we can enjoy our prosperity and pleasures. Dr. Judd admitted De Gaulle is following a tragic course but couldn't blame him because twelve years ago De Gaulle forecast America would be like the Carthaginians of old.

Who were the Carthaginians? The Carthaginians were one of the greatest people of ancient times. Their city, Carthage, was famed for its size and wealth, the great empire which it ruled, and the extent of its trade. It had an excellent location on the shore of the Mediterranean. The city of Carthage had two harbors; one for fighting ships and one for trading vessels. The docks in the military harbor were 16 feet wide and 220 ships could tie up in them at once. Less than a mile north of the harbors a fortress on the hill of Bursa guarded the city. Behind the city, cutting it off from the peninsula, were three walls of towers guarding Carthage against attack by land. It was impregnable to outside attack but they lost their freedom by default. They made concessions, worshipped pleasure, became complacent, soft, and flabby. And today, all that remains of the beauty and the power of ancient Carthage is its tombs and the ruins of its buildings.

How do we lose freedom? A wise man once observed, "Liberty means responsibility. That is why most men dread it. But if you dread it and ignore it how long can it last? Freedom, like a receding hairline, isn't lost all at once. It goes gradually."

Unless there is a moral regeneration said Judd, there is no hope for us. Discipline, passion, concern, righteousness, these are the only things that count. Purity is more important than soap; intention than invention; faith than facts. Why we live means more than where we live; how we feel more than how we look; what we are more than what we have. God means more than gadgets. Affairs now are soul size and only those men and women with large souls and hearts will solve them. Without such spiritually mature men and women we shall be, as Lincoln put it, "merely tinkers, trying to put together a universe that is too big for us."

Dr. Walter Millekan, late of Cal-Tech, wrote that he felt science lifts us up on the horizontal and that religion lifts us on the perpendicular. Without the upward pull of religion, science would crawl on its belly—a serpent with a deadly sting.

The Nazis made this mistake. Their progress, as someone wrote, was in gadgets instead of God; in inventions rather than in spiritual intentions. In his Mein Kampf, Hitler wrote: "Look at those young men and boys. What material! I shall eradicate a thousand years of human domestication. Brutal youth, that is what I am after! I want to see once more in its eyes, the gleam of the beast of prey. With these I can create a new world and a new order."

And he did—the order of the jungle in which men's fingers became claws and their hands became paws.

Dr. Judd pointed out this obvious fact too, the other night. That animals kill only when cornered or forced to, for food. Only man kills and kills and kills with tongue as with weapon.

Mark Twain felt this way. He ridiculed the claim that man was created in God's image. Not only is he not a child of God, but he is not worthy to occupy the same planet with other decent animals. Today much of our novels and plays echo Twain: "Lord of the Flies", "Whose Afraid of Virginia Woolf?", "The Toilet." I guess we will always face the peril of the educated savage.

One day Paul E. Tracy gazed at the bronze statute of an Indian brave with bow and arrow ready, dressed in a loincloth and comparing his relative harmlessness with the atomic power of the hour, Tracy wrote these lines about "The Coppered Archer:

"Unlettered one, mute and alone,
With your enduring tips of stone,
Sleep on, and take unbroken rest.
Your sage is wet, your crags are dressed in fog.
Sleep while you can, the atom age is set for men.
Your bow and brittle flints
Did little more than make those wince
You sought to slay.
You could not wince or scar mankind
Like us today.
Sleep, simple one, ignoring change.
Your hunting ground is now a range
For bombs unduly bright and loud,
From Yucca Flat the mushroom cloud
Ascends and puny warfare ends.
Sleep on and rest, untutored brave,
Tense is the air above your grave."

No one would deny the fact that America must have a strong arm, but let her have a great soul as well, and that can only be gotten by a moral regeneration. Our civilization is so lopsided, so much body and brain, so little soul to move it. We have more things than we have the character to handle. We have more power than we have the spirit to direct it. And everywhere there is an emptiness, a frustration and a restlessness. H. G. Wells was right when he said, "There is a God-shaped vacuum in every man's soul." Charles Stiemnetz, the electrical wizard, made a prediction some years ago. He said we would come to the place of frustration and would discover we were on the wrong track. People would learn that material things did not make happiness and they are of little use in making people creative and powerful. Then the laboratories would be turned over to an examination of the neglected, unseen spirit-forces, and men would explore the wider, eternal world of which our world is only a little part. Then, with the awakening of man's spirit, there would come a leap forward in the world's life and more would happen in a century than in a thousand previous years.

The man at the well said the same thing. "Everyone who drinks of this water shall be thirsty again." There is no lasting satisfaction in our things. God never made the soul of man so small that he could be satisfied with a multiplication of things. He was made for eternal life and nothing else can satisfy his soul. "You shall thirst again." The Samaritan woman found that out. She, a thorough going materialist had made a terrible mess of things; she had tried all the wells and cisterns and found no living water. But first, the sins must go. "Go call your husband." Five husbands she had had. Sounds like Hollywood. Then Jesus led her out of the darkness into the light. Jesus kindled a light in that woman's heart—a heart in which all the light had gone out and that spark went like a hallowed fire throughout the whole town. The woman left her waterpot and went into the city and said, "Come, see a man. Is not this the Christ?" What began in a conservation ended in a spiritual awakening in a village.

There is a hint of what might happen to the human spirit now with the touch of Christ upon it. We have gone as far as we can in materialism, and all the wells are dry. Why do we live as if God were dead and Christ had never come? I've asked myself that a thousand times lately. The touch of Christ upon the spirit is not an old story; it still happens. He has the cure for the world's ills. It is up to us to apply it. We must not be daunted by the world's confusions, fears, and frustrations. We must have but one fear now, and that is the fear of failing God. Faith is as contagious as fear. We have at our command forces that can never be exhausted.

"He has sounded forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat;
He is sifting out the hearts of men before His judgment seat;
O, be swift my soul, to answer Him, be jubilant my feet!
Our God is Marching On."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Grand Canyon Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, a timely defense of the Grand Canyon was presented by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable HENRY S. REUSS, in his letter to the Washington Post of July 25, 1966.

As Congressman REUSS points out:

> If Congress acts wisely, Arizona can have water and America can continue to have the Grand Canyon as nature made it.

This analysis speaks directly and perceptively to the problem and I include it for my colleagues' consideration:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 25, 1966]

GRAND CANYON THREAT

Your editorial on the "Colorado River Issue" seems to pose a false alternative: shall "vital" additional water be supplied to Arizona or shall we avoid any "further obstruction of the picturesque Colorado," which is a highly euphemistic way of describing the huge dams proposed at Bridge and Marble Canyons in the Grand Canyon.

In fact, the two dams are not necessary for the physical diversion of water from the Colorado into Arizona. The water impoundments created by the dams would make available less water (because of evaporation), not more, for Arizona's farms, industries, and people.

The purpose of the dams is to finance the project through the sale of electricity. Yet other means of provided needed electric power and of financing the water supply project are possible and economically advantageous. Thus if Congress acts wisely, Arizona can have water and America can continue to have the Grand Canyon as nature made it.

"Any grave encroachment upon the Grand Canyon National Park itself would be unthinkable," the editorial says. But unless America is willing to give up its far-sighted commitment to the preservation of wilderness areas and of its irreplaceable natural wonders, the entire Grand Canyon—all 280 miles of it—should be saved and protected as a great national asset.

It is no less unthinkable to destroy the parts of the Grand Canyon outside the 105-mile-long Park than it would be to "encroach" upon the Park. It is not the legal entity that is the Park but the unique ecological entity that is the Canyon which needs protection.

And it would be, to use the editorial's words, "plain nonsense" to speak of these dams as making minor changes in the Grand Canyon. They would turn 132 miles of the river into unneeded storage reservoirs. They would put such scenes of beauty as Redwall Cavern under 280 feet of water. Their reservoirs would cover beaches and sandbars, wipe out the habitat of wildlife and plants and inundate the geological records of millions of years.

The goal is to supply water so that Arizona can continue to enjoy one of the highest population growth rates in the Nation. As a Congressman who is concerned with the development of all America, I am ready to vote taxpayers' money to help Arizona get more water—but not to alter 132 of the 280 miles of one of the world's great natural wonders.

HENRY S. REUSS,
Representative from Wisconsin.
WASHINGTON.

Our Religious Heritage Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the National Congress of the Sons of the American Revolution recently conducted an oratorical contest for high school boys.

Many excellent speeches were delivered by the 15 competing boys and one, by Anthony Gilbert Mitchell, 130 Goodrich Avenue, Lexington, Ky., entitled "Our Religious Heritage Threatened," in my opinion, merits the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR RELIGIOUS HERITAGE THREATENED

(By Anthony Gilbert Mitchell)

In June of 1963, by an 8 to 1 decision, the United States Supreme Court declared that it was unconstitutional to recite the Lord's Prayer and to conduct devotional Bible readings in public schools. The High Court based its decision on the first part of the First Amendment of the Constitution.

The pre-Revolutionary principle of separation of Church and State has today evolved into a separation of religion and state, especially in our public systems. Thomas Jefferson originated the idea of the "wall" between church and state to keep the two institutions from overlapping or unifying. Through his efforts, the writers of the Constitution stated that: "Congress shall make no law representing an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. . ."

It was Jefferson's desire to prevent any denomination or religious sect in the United States from becoming a ruling sect. Fresh in the minds of the Framers of the Constitution was the religious persecution conducted by the Church of England. It had become not only a spiritual ruler of its people, but also a governmental ruler in civil affairs.

In Jefferson's attempt to separate Church and State, did he mean to build his "wall" between Religion and State? The founders of this nation were just as concerned with the practice of religion within the state as they were with the separation of Church and State. They placed "In God We Trust" on our coins as a symbol of that conviction. Very early in our history we were called a "Christian Nation", and we honored that commitment to religious beliefs by observing the Sabbath as a Holy day and as a day of rest. Our national pledge professes that we are a "Nation under God" but in our public schools, Jefferson's separation has led to an attempt to delete religious principles and acknowledgement of God.

The Ten Commandments have been declared undesirable instructional material by the Board of Education in New Hyde Park, Long Island. The Ten Commandments have been banned likewise in public schools in New Jersey. This ban is rather ironical in view of the fact that all of the moral laws that exist in civilized nations today are derived directly or indirectly from the Ten Commandments.

Public school teachers in the various fifty states of the Union may and should teach about the gods of Greece, the gods of Rome, and the gods of Egypt, but they may not teach about the one true God. Why? Because this is religion. Last year in my class in United States History, we spent six weeks studying Communist doctrine, but no time was allotted to the teachings of the Master Teacher.

Our American forefathers never dreamed of education without religion. Horace Mann, the father of tax-supported "public schools", strongly believed that the Bible should be a basic part of a child's education. McGuffey's Reader was also oriented in this direction.

Education without God is like an engine without a governor. "Without religious motive" says Wyatt Brown, "Education is adding power to irresponsibility." Theodore Roosevelt said, "Mere education, without divine guidance, is like giving a gun to an irresponsible man."

One of the most heart rending occurrences of this century took place in Russia in the mid-winter of 1962–63. A group of Russian Baptists walked over 2000 miles in freezing cold to the American Embassy in Moscow and begged permission to come to America. Their plea was not only refused, but they were turned over to the Russian police. The conscience of the entire Free World was outraged by the brutal treatment these people received after their fantastic journey and presentation of their humble request.

The main reason they gave for wanting to come to America was that their children would not have to attend Russian schools any longer and be taught by atheists. If these pathetic people had been allowed to come to "Christian America" they would have found some shocking things here that are almost identical to those in Russia.

In 1964, Mrs. Madalyn Murray, an atheist, carried her case to the Supreme Court to contest prayers in the public schools. The Court declared prayers unconstitutional, and then Mrs. Murray faded out of the national picture. Many people have asked, "What has happened to this woman who has tried so hard to take God out of America?" She lost favor in her own hometown and she was publicly banned from several other cities including Boston. Shortly after her escapade in the Supreme Court, her husband divorced her and her oldest son was sentenced to serve time in the penitentiary. But, "old soldiers never die," and Mrs. Murray is presently trying to erase the "Nation under God" from our Pledge of Allegiance. Is this not an example of the insidious ways of those who dare to abolish God?

As the schools go, so goes the nation. Unless our young people receive a strong education and are motivated by the highest principles in our religious heritage, what can we expect of our future leaders?

Freedom of religious expression is a basic human right. Many of the original Colonies were founded upon religious liberty. Jefferson's "wall" between church and state should remain intact, but the religious principles upon which this country was founded must not be discarded nor replaced by godless doctrines in our public schools.

J. E. Kennedy Retires From Customs Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, after more than 42 years of outstanding customs work in Baltimore, Mr. J. Eugene Kennedy retired from his post as District Director of Customs. Baltimore is one of the busiest and most important port cities in the United States, and efficient and reliable customs workers like Mr. Kennedy have contributed to Baltimore's current status as a port city. The Havre de Grace Record of July 14, 1966, summarized Mr. Kennedy's accomplishments in his long career, and I should like to bring this article to the attention of my colleagues:

J. E. Kennedy Retires From Customs Post

Mr. J. Eugene Kennedy, district director of customs, retired on his birthday last Thursday after more than 42 years of customs work in Baltimore. A native of Havre de Grace, he has been dubbed "Mr. Customs" and "the fount of all knowledge" regarding collection problems along the entire East Coast.

In an interview with the Record on Monday, Mr. Kennedy was enthusiastic about the full life he anticipates in the future as he maintains an interest in a warehouse business he helped to found, plays the piano for his "own amazement" and files the mementos of the past fruitful years.

Mr. Kennedy was honored at a gathering of some 300 persons last Thursday night including many co-workers, the city's Congressional delegation—Representatives Fallon, Garmatz, and Friedel, and Thomas J. D'Alesandro, 3rd, president of the Baltimore City Council and acting mayor.

In paying tribute to Mr. Kennedy, the speakers praised him for helping to build Baltimore to its present status as a port city. One recalled when he entered the customs service in 1924 as a clerk-stenographer—"a freckle faced boy with bushy red hair". Present indications are that the hair has given way to forehead.

The Bureau of Customs' highest award was presented Mr. Kennedy, the Honor Award, making him the tenth man ever to receive it. He has also received the Treasury Department's Gallatin Award for distinguished service. Mr. D'Alesandro presented him the city's "Outstanding Citizenship" award.

The Kennedy family, not to be confused with the Cape Cod Kennedys, the retiree hastened to point out, consists of his wife, the former Agnes Eustace of Aberdeen and four children: John E. Jr., 25, a graduate of Cornell now with the IBM Company; Ann Carey, 24 a graduate of Notre Dame Preparatory School and Villa Julie Junior College, now employed as an investigative aide for the House Public Works Committee of which Rep. Fallon is chairman; James E., 20, a student at Cornell in the field of Metallurgical engineering and Joseph Robert, 18, a recent graduate of Boys Latin School.

Mr. Kennedy is an accomplished pianist and studied for a number of years at Peabody Conservatory of Music. Long time residents remember with pleasure several concerts he gave in Havre de Grace many years ago.

Treatment of Americans Captured by the North Vietnamese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Wednesday, July 27, 1966, the Augusta Chronicle, Augusta, Ga., published an editorial entitled "The Mark of the Beast." The editorial concerns itself with the treatment of American fliers captured by the North Vietnamese and reports of executions by beheading. It also takes note of the barbaric actions of the Communists who have been shooting our wounded on the field of battle. This entire area is a most serious problem and demands immediate and affirmative attention. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Mark of the Beast

A group of American fliers captured by the North Vietnamese after being shot down will not be tried as "war criminals"—yet, at least. That's the word relayed to our government through diplomatic channels.

President Ho Chi Minh is quoted by a Czech news agency as stating, in Hanoi, that North Viet Nam in this decision has behaved in a humane manner. No doubt, around the world, advocates of a free hand for the Communists in South Viet Nam will parrot this claim, and use it as ammunition for new attacks against resistance to aggression.

If a humane element is involved, it is sheer coincidence. Humaneness is not communism's way. Ask refugees from the Baltic states, from Hungary, from Tibet. The deciding factor in the decision with regard to the fliers is propaganda value. By this means, the friends of communism around the world are permitted to compare the "humane" Ho with the "ruthless" Johnson, who is ordering barbarous attacks on a Viet Cong which wants only a peaceful, democratic dialogue with the obstinate South Vietnamese who erroneously think freedom is good for them.

Even as the message on rejection of a "trial" was being evaluated in Washington, North Vietnamese regular army units illegally in South Viet Nam were overrunning an American unit. The Americans had been forced by heavy attack to withdraw without even an opportunity to evacuate their wounded. A survivor said the advancing North Vietnamese fired bullets into the heads of any wounded Americans who moved, killing at least six and then looting the bodies of any valuables.

At the same time, an American Navy airman who had escaped from a North Vietnamese prisoner of war camp was telling of the fate of a fellow-escapee who was captured by pursuing North Vietnamese. As the survivors hid and looked on, the "humane" Communists summarily beheaded the American they had caught.

These men, wounded on the battlefield or fleeing a prison camp, were beyond combat status. They were defenseless, and by all the rules of civilized conduct were prisoners. By the vicious and barbarous way in which they were done to death, they join many thousands of others in South Viet Nam who have suffered hideous deaths at the hands of Communists. They share the fate of village chiefs and their families tortured to death to intimidate the villages. They share the fate of civilians in Saigon who have been callously bombed into oblivion by the Viet Cong who—we are told in some quarters—simply are seeking their rights.

Regardless of who is spared from a trumped-up "war crimes" trial in the prison camps of North Viet Nam, these men were given not even the benefit of mock trials. They were simply slaughtered by Communists acting like Communists.

Such incidents mark the character of the forces under Ho who will be enabled to perpetrate more of the same kind of atrocities if we can just be persuaded to cease oil depot bombing, and let more of the killers move south. They mark the foreseeable action of future waves of invaders if we will just "deescalate," or withdraw our forces and let Ho's horror sweep over the South Vietnamese countryside.

Such incidents place the mark of the beast also on the Soviet Union, which is supposedly a peace-loving member of the United Nations, and on Red China, for which many persons in a soft-on-communism bloc are trying to win UN membership. Russia's active participation in aggresion by sending weapons and munitions to Hanoi, and Peking's vociferous moral support and threats of intervention brand them as being unworthy of associating in the society of civilized nations.

Colorado River Project—Address by Hon. Barry Goldwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 27, former Senator Barry Goldwater addressed the National Press Club on one of his favorite subjects—the Colorado River project. Senator Goldwater particularly addressed himself to the false impressions given by preservationist groups as to the effect Marble and Hualapai Dams would have on the Grand Canyon. Since the Senators knows the canyon like he knows his own Arizona patio, his remarks are particularly well-informed and persuasive, and I include them herewith:

Excerpts of Remarks by Hon. Barry Goldwater to the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. President, friends of the Press, I trust you'll forgive me today if I appear before you in a slightly different role from the one in which I have appeared here on so many occasions in the past. For once, I am not going to exhort you about politics or my views on the state of international affairs or the problems we are encountering on the domestic front. I have no doubt that some of you will get at these matters when the question period is held. But, in the meantime, you might say, I have a captive audience. And I want to use the opportunity to talk with you about one of the great wonders of the world which happens to be located in my home state of Arizona. I want to talk with you about the Grand Canyon and, in doing so, to lay to rest one of the greatest campaigns of misinformation I have ever encountered—in or out of politics.

My reference, of course, is to the printed propaganda we see in some magazines and newspapers to the effect that the Central Arizona Project involving the construction of two dams in the Grand Canyon area will ruin one of the scenic wonders of the American West and of the entire world. Many uninformed persons have been led to believe, for example, that completion of this sorely-needed project would turn one of nature's great wonders into a huge bathtub filled with water. The Sierra Club, which is leading much of the opposition to the Central Arizona Project, uses ridiculous words like "inundate" and "flood" to describe what will happen if the dams are built to supply the people of my state with the water they need to exist and flourish in Arizona's desert valleys. The technique employed by these opponents of progress is a familiar one: It is the "Big Lie" technique which rests on the belief that if you repeat a plausible falsehood often enough it eventually will be accepted as truth by an uninformed majority of the nation's citizens.

Now I don't pretend to be the world's greatest living expert on the Grand Canyon. But, I do lay claim to having spent more time traveling in and exploring the Caynon than many of the CAP's critics have spent looking at it from the vantage point of the tourist.

The project involves construction of two dams. Today, because of the brevity of time, I will discuss only one of these, the Hualapai, which dam would back up a lake which would touch the western boundaries of the National Park for 13 miles. The other dam, Marble Canyon, in no way touches the National Park, it being 12 miles outside the boundary. However, much of what I say about Hualapai dam would apply equally to Marble.

Hualapai Dam would be built three miles above the present Lake Mead formed by the Hoover Dam. It would be 600 feet high in the bottom of a canyon 5,000 feet deep and roughly ten miles wide. The lake resulting from this dam would at no point in its 90 miles climb out of the inner gorge of the Canyon. At one point it would approximate two miles in width but the average width would be under 1,000 feet.

There is only one point accessible on either rim of the Canyon from which this lake could be seen and that point has been visited by fewer than 200 people a year. Even after reaching this point and looking straight down into the Canyon, one would have difficulty determining whether the lake was actually a lake or the river because the width would be approximately the same.

This lake would not destroy any archeological points of interest, nor would it inundate any geological forms which could not be seen elsewhere in the Canyon. It would not harm wildlife because the wildlife would merely move into the side canyons as they already do to escape flash floods.

It would not "kill" the living river because there would remain 104 miles of this vast, flowing and beautiful stream above the lake.

I want to repeat one important fact overlooked by the Sierra Club, and that is that there is now only one point available to the tourists on either rim from which the lake could be seen and that would require travel that has not been accomplished by many people in the existence of the road one has to travel over to reach this point.

To illustrate how patently ridiculous are the claims that the Central Arizona Project would "inundate" or "flood" the Grand Canyon, let me point out that there presently is not enough concrete in the entire world to construct a dam large enough to flood the Grand Canyon or turn it into a "bathtub." Even if there were, another obstacle presents itself—there would be no way to fill such a lake with water. It certainly could not be filled by waters from the Colorado River. The rate of evaporation alone would make this an impossibility.

Now having disposed of the propaganda lies raised by its opponents, I should like to take a few minutes to explain the importance and the mechanics of the Central Arizona Project.

The problem, of course, is water. And the Central Arizona Project as a means of providing that water is not a new idea. In fact, I think that the Ho-Ho-Kam Indians, who lived in the Arizona desert valleys thousands of years ago, must have thought of something similar before they were forced to leave for lack of water. The words "Ho-Ho-Kam," incidentally mean "People Who Have Gone."

Five civilizations have been forced to leave the desert valleys of Arizona because of the great need for water in these arid regions. And we, who have made our homes in these beautiful areas, do not want to become the sixth civilization to be forced out.

It is because of dire necessity that we have looked to the transportation of supplementary water supplies from the Colorado River to the central valleys of Arizona. Originally, the project was designed to supply water chiefly for agricultural uses. But, our population explosion has been so great that it becomes more obvious every day that the supplementary water will have to be used for essential domestic purposes.

We propose to do this under the powers granted the Federal government under the Reclamation Act, which has been in existence for many years and under which vast projects have been constructed in the arid sections of the West.

And, I might say in passing, that because I have long stood for the principle of confining the extension of Washington's power my advocacy of the Central Arizona Project has drawn some snide and derisive comments from writers who haven't gone to the trouble of informing themselves accurately.

For their particular information, I should like to point out that many of the West's reclamation projects already have been paid for—not by the nation's taxpayers, but by the people who have used the water in the affected areas. What's more, this financing arrangement is being applied to all other such projects.

In the case of the Central Arizona Project, it is true that the initial outlays would be provided by Congressional authorization. But, it is equally true that under the provisions of the Reclamation Act we, the users, are obligated to pay back every cent of federal money except that used for functions which are specifically allocated to the federal government under the Constitution. This is a lot different than the picture painted by some eastern columnists and editorial writers of Arizona conservatives fighting federal power in other States while holding out their hands for the Central Arizona Project. They don't seem inclined to explain that Arizona is NOT asking for something for nothing but for a necessity its people intend to pay for.

Those who believe that Arizona is asking for a giant handout would do well to look into the history of the Theodore Roosevelt Dam, which was completed in 1911. In this instance, the users were charged with the repayment of 85 percent of all funds used. The other 15 percent is charged off to the Federal Government for its constitutionally-ordered responsibilities.

The money now has been repaid and as a result of the foresight of the founders of the Roosevelt Dam Project, the valley that I look out upon from my study window is the fastest growing industrial area in the entire country. It is also one of the fastest-growing population areas in the nation.

In closing, let me emphasize that I yield to no one in my love of nature, particularly the spectacular brand with which my home state has been so bounteously endowed. But, even this love, must be subjugated, if needs be, to the requirements of people to live and to prosper with adequate supplies of water.

Happily, in the case of the Grand Canyon, no nature lover needs to be concerned. For, under the Central Arizona Project, the needed water can be supplied without damaging—in anyway whatsoever—the grandeur and beauty of the Canyon.

Now Is the Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed with the editorial, "A Chance To Clean House," which appeared in the August issue of Farm Journal. As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I certainly feel the four-point plan suggested by the editor, Carroll P. Streeter, deserves serious attention by everyone in the Congress directly or indirectly concerned with agriculture.

The article follows:

A CHANCE TO CLEAN HOUSE

(By Carroll P. Streeter)

Since World War II we have built up an incredible jumble of measures to "solve the farm problem" (or at least the politicians' problem with it). We've spent a prodigious sum and have precious little to show for it.

Now the times are presenting us with the chance to sweep out the whole mess and get down to the simple program we need.

Not only do we have no surpluses of consequence overhanging the market (except for cotton and tobacco), we may indeed be approaching scarcity of some commodities. Milk for one. Wheat and feed grains for others, as pointed out by Dr. Karl Hobson on page 21 of this issue. A few months ago, Farm Journal reported that a beef shortage may be ahead. Despite the biggest soybean crop on record we have no real over-supply.

Chief reason our food stocks are vanishing is unprecedented prosperity here and abroad, not our relatively ineffective but costly farm programs.

The need for a basic change is urgent. Farmers are now in the fix where they are depending on government, not the market, for $3.5 billion of their annual income. A mighty vulnerable situation that is, when the money has to be voted annually by a city-dominated Congress. Farmers had better be getting their heads out of the noose. It could by pulled tighter any day.

What then to do?

Well how about this for a four-point program?

1. Put sufficient crop land into 5- or 10-year retirement to keep surpluses from recurring.

What's "sufficient" we won't try to say here. Some economists think we could turn loose the whole 50 million acres we now have on the shelf without creating a problem. Others say that by 1975 we will actually have to retire 25 million acres *more,* due to our big yield increases.

Whatever the amount, this land might better be in some kind of long-term reserve than be dependent on farmers' compliance with annual crop programs, as most of the 50 million now is. The latter way of retiring land is too expensive, but worse yet it puts farmers under the thumb of the Secretary of Agriculture who becomes a sort of Master Manager of U.S. agriculture.

2. Let farmers decide how to farm the remainder, not a bunch of bureaucrats down in Washington. Get the Secretary of Agriculture's mitts out of it!

The market can tell farmers, better than the Secretary can, how much we need of what. The market will cure, more surely and wisely than he can, prices that are "too high," or too low either. Let's let the market do it.

3. Keep necessary reserves of food, but—let the private grain trade and farmers hold most of it. Government stocks should be small, and be padlocked, with Congress holding the key—not the Secretary of Agriculture or even the President. The government can buy any more it needs in the market at market price.

Farmers have had a belly full, to put it mildly, of seeing the Secretary club the prices of feed grains, wheat, hogs, beef cattle and cheese in the interest of consumers. And it will take a lot more than a soothing speech in Des Moines by the President to make them forget it.

4. Retain government price supports, at or below market levels, not above. Let supports revert to their original function of stabilizing prices in time to glut—and quit there.

Special additional provisions may be needed for special commodities, but these four planks could be the framework of a new farm program. Is it too simple? We believe not. We could use a litle simplicity for a change.

If we had such a program:

Farmers would be largely free of government controls.

They'd take management of U.S. farming back into their own hands, relieving the Secretary of Agriculture of it.

The nation would save a substantial amount of money.

Supplies and prices would be better adjusted, over a period of time, than when a few mortal men try to do it.

We have a remarkable chance to clean house. To use a FARM JOURNAL phrase: "Now Is the Time to."

Somerset, Ky., Jaycees Tops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIM LEE CARTER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, which appeared in the Somerset, Ky., Commonwealth Journal, on July 4, 1966, records the achievements of the Somerset Jaycees as the No. 1 chapter in all America in the area of civil improvement.

I am proud of this forward-looking group of young men in my district.

LOCAL JAYCEE CHAPTER TOPS IN UNITED STATES

The Somerset Jaycees were named one of America's top 10 Jaycee chapters last week at the U.S. Jaycee National Convention in Detroit, Michigan.

The local chapter was awarded the Clarence Howard Award, presented annually to the top local Jaycee club across the country.

Possibly more impressive was the fact that the local group was also honored as the No. 1 chapter in all America in thhe area of Civic Improvement. The Civic Improvement Sweepstakes trophy, presented to immediate past president John Fitzwater by U.S. Jaycee president Jim Skidmore, gives Somerset the distinction of leading the United States in Community Development for 1965–66.

The local chapter had earlier won four awards in competition with chapters in their population division.

Tom Christerson, president of the local chapter, said today the club will enter international competition later this year in the civic improvement area.

Two Columns by Mr. Arthur Hoppe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arthur Hoppe recently paid a visit to Washington and two of his columns I think are extremely pertinent to our situation here in Washington, D.C., as of today. These columns were published in the San Francisco Chronicle of July 22 and July 24.

L.B.J. REVIVES A FORGOTTEN ART

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson held a formal press conference and everybody had a very exciting time. Particularly the White House press. In fact, I feared for a moment there they might panic.

"A full-scale, televised White House press conference," cried one middle-aged veteran newsman when the news was announced 24 hours in advance. "What's that?"

But everyone shook their heads in wonderment. At last a grizzled old-timer piped up: "Seems to me I remember the last time President Johnson held a formal White House press conference. 'Twas back in 19 and 65. Or maybe ought eight. Why I can even recollect the days when Presidents had press conferences once a week or so."

"No!" said a young reporter incredulously. "What on earth for?"

"So's he could find out what folks were thinking and explain what he was doing," said the old-timer. "He could tell from our questions."

"You mean we get to ask questions? Oh, what fun. I've been wanting to ask him for ever so long: 'Mr. President, how come after all you've given the people, you aren't loved?' "

"No, no," said the old-timer, shocked. "You can't ask questions like that. You got to ask him about Vietnam mostly. With maybe a couple on inflation, strikes, riots and politics. That way, he can tell what folks are thinking and tell what he's doing."

So all the White House reporters were very excited thinking up lengthy questions that would show their knowledge. "But what's the procedure?" said the young reporter suddenly. "Do we ask them alphabetically or by seniority or do we just raise our hands?"

But try try as he might, not even the old-timer could recollect a detail like that from way back when. So everybody was awfully nervous when we gathered in the East Room of the White House on the big day. There were the television cameras and the lights and I don't think anyone would have asked a question for fear of doing it wrong.

But Mr. Bill Moyers, who is the President's right hand man and very smart, stood up first and said: "The press conference will start at 4:01 p.m. To ask a question, please stand. The President will acknowledge you with a nod or a wave of his hand. Give your name and the name of your organization."

So everything went just fine. The reporters asked 20 questions, nine on Vietnam and a couple each on inflation, strikes, riots and politics. The President said he was for peace in Vietnam and for honoring our commitments. And he said he was against inflation, strikes, riots and a Republican victory at the polls.

"My, that sure did take me back," said the grizzled old-timer afterward with a nostalgic smile. "That's exactly what he said the last time he held a press conference."

All the reporters agreed that it had been very interesting taking part in this revival of a historic democratic tradition. "Kind of like visiting Williamsburg," as one put it. And some even expressed hope the President would do it again on some regular basis. As often as once a year, even.

But the idea was hooted down. "After all," said one reporter, "our job is to find out what the President's doing and thinking. And we can't waste our time on a lot of silly old-fashioned ceremonies."

WEIRD WASHINGTON MYSTERY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—You may recall that book I'm writing, "Strange Native Customs in Washington & Other Savage Lands." Well, I've stumbled over a problem so vast and so intriguing that I can hardly wait to lay it before my colleagues at the next International Symposium of Anthropologists.

I was working on my chapter, "Indigenous Native Tongues." As you know, the natives speak a common language. And while intonation and the meaning of some words vary among the local tribes such as the Solons, Pentagon and White House, they can usually understand each other. If they want to.

There is also a written language used solely for rituals. It is called "Clear and Concise." Indeed, hardly a week passes that some chieftain doesn't order his tribe to write their memos and other sacred scriptures in "Clear and Concise Language." Unfortunately, however, it remains undecipherable.

I had begun my work, as is customary, on the native form of greeting. I had discovered that on two natives meeting at a cocktail party or other savage rite they first identify their tribes and then one smiles and utters the traditional word, "Whereyoufrom?"

At first, I assumed this was a pledge of peace, a prayer for rain or the invocation of some local diety. Imagine my surprise to learn on further inquiry that this universal greeting is actually a contraction of "where do you come from?"

"But don't all the local inhabitants come from Washington?" I asked a friendly guide.

"Oh, no," he said, "everybody here comes from some place else."

And it's true; I have asked scores upon scores of natives the same question and it appears that no one has ever been born in Washington.

As far as can be determined the typical native suddenly appears full-grown in the tribe and, after a brief period of indoctrination, is soon indistinguishable from the others in speech patterns, ritual knowledge and method of thing.

Even more odd, no one in Washington ever dies. The native, after fighting in the constant intertribal battles for an indeterminate number of years, simply vanishes.

Each native believes devoutly in his own nirvana, depending on his status. The lower orders call their "Retirement," which is always "a long way off." The higher subchiefs speak of "Private Industry," which they hope to reach "any day." While no two can agree on where this heaven is, they all agree on one thing: it isn't in Washington.

Thus we find a weird nomadic culture unparalleled in the annals of anthropology. Even the most backward aboriginal tribes have roots in their own land. It's what gives them direction and purpose. And the lack of it certainly explains a lot about Washington.

But, of course, many crucial questions remain to be answered. Where do these natives come from? Where do they go? And most puzzling of all to anyone who has experienced a Washington summer or winter, why on earth do they stay here at all?

Reclaiming the American Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor this afternoon to commend to the Members of this body one of the most challenging and thoughtful books on American politics to be published in the past decade. The book is Richard C. Cornuelle's "Reclaiming the American Dream," New York; Random House, 1965. Since this book should receive as much careful attention as possible, I take this opportunity to reiterate some of its major points, so that other Members and the general public might become acquainted with the author's thought-provoking analysis.

Mr. Cornuelle's essential thesis is that the present political debate over the allocation of functions between Government and the private sector is fundamentally sterile. The private sector is characterized by the profit motive and the enhancement of freedom. The Government sector's virtue—optimistically speaking—is its interest in public responsibility and welfare. In his view, the clash of Government versus private leaves out the "independent sector," the voluntary associations founded to solve public problems.

The independent sector is neither governmental or commercial. It is independent in that its operation does not depend on profit or mass political support, but voluntary contribution of time and money to solving public problems. In the past, as Mr. Cornuelle documents, the ability of independent associations to solve public problems without recourse to the deadening hand of Government allowed the growing American society to be both humane and free. But during the depression, confidence in private, voluntary associations was shaken in spite of their mammoth relief efforts, and the flight from private responsibility began.

Mr. Cornuelle maintains that we must break the present deadlock between conservatives who fight waste endlessly and oppose all assumption of governmental responsibility and liberals whose only remedy—Government—has proven to be ineffective in urban renewal, agricultural price support programs, and elsewhere and at the sacrifice of some freedom. The independent sector must revitalize itself, and use the methods of modern management—both business and government—to solve problems which both Government and the private sector have been unable to solve. The competition of Government and the independent sector for the efficient and humane solution of problems is welcomed by Mr. Cornuelle, provided that adequate information and publicity is given to the independent sector's case—which is not often true.

The case of the United Student Aid Funds, Inc., a nonprofit corporation established to extend loans to college students through the cooperation of the Nation's bank, is cited as a documented study of the independent sector's ability to zero in on and solve problems without resort to Federal action. Mr. Cornuelle describes four tasks which the independent sector must accomplish in order to compete effectively with Government—research, development, mobilization and information. If the independent sector can organize its efforts to accomplish these tasks, Mr. Cornuelle holds out the hope that we might reclaim the American dream of a free and humane society. I am sure that other members will join me in this hope.

Mining Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, Colorado received its first economic impetus from the mining industry. My State has long been known for the mineral wealth it has produced, and has long been a leading producer of those metals without which a modern economy cannot exist. But in recent years, some mining enterprises in my State have fallen upon hard times, and foreign dumping of excess supplies of certain metals has contributed to this situation.

The lead and zinc producers of Colorado have been among the sufferers. I feel this situation should at least be alleviated by Federal action. A bill I now offer would accomplish this, and I am most pleased to join with my distinguished colleague, the senior member of the Colorado delegation and chairman of the House Interior Committee, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, in offering this legislation.

This bill provides for flexible quota legislation with a 5-year term. During this period, quotas on either lead or zinc ores and metal would become effective for a 3-year period if domestic producers' metal stocks reach levels considered excessive as defined in the bill.

The quotas would be canceled if stocks were reduced below normal levels and additional imports were needed. A minimum import quota would be guaranteed. Producer, consumer, and importer fare well under this flexible quota system, which is based on supply and demand for these metals in our domestic markets. It would only be in effect when it was proved necessary to stabilize the supply-consumption rate at proper levels. It will alleviate some of the hardships the lead and zinc producers of Colorado are now laboring under. It will inject new vitality into that industry in my State.

Will the Real Criminal Please Stand Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS WALKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, not long ago the Washington newspapers carried banner headlines about a single shooting in the State of Mississippi where an individual was attacked by an assailant with a shotgun filled with birdshot. Many of the members of the press editorialized against this act as a vicious crime of violence—and were very quick to condemn my State—even through this crime was not committed by a Mississippian.

In the Washington Evening Star, Thursday, July 28, 1966, there appeared an article on the back page of section E. This article entitled "District of Columbia Area Crime Rise Is Fastest in United States."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring this back page article to the attention of each of my colleagues and ask: "Will the real criminals please stand up?"

The article follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AREA CRIME RISE IS FASTEST IN UNITED STATES

Crime in Washington Metropolitan area last year increased at a rate considerably above that in the rest of the nation, the FBI said yesterday in its annual Uniform Crime Report.

While serious crimes in the nation in 1965 increased over 1964 by 6.3 percent, the Washington area registered an 8.9 percent increase, and crime in the District jumped by 11 percent.

The District's increase was nearly three times the rate reported for large cities in the nation with populations of more than 250,000 persons. Crime in these cities went up an average of only 4 percent.

Further, the FBI report noted there are an average of 1.7 sworn police per 1,000 persons in the nation, while the D.C. Crime Commission noted last week the District has the largest police force per person in the country.

CITY UNDERPROTECTED

The District has 3.86 policemen per 1,000 persons. The crime commission emphasized that despite the comparatively large force, the city is being "under-protected" because of improper use and supervision of the men.

The FBI's Crime Index is a compilation of reported offenses in seven categories, murder and non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny of $50 and up, and auto theft.

The metropolitan area figures were reported by the District, Montgomery and Prince Georges County in Maryland; the cities of Alexandria, Fairfax, and Fall Church, and counties of Arlington and Fairfax in Virginia.

The report of these areas showed there were 51,947 crimes reported in the Washington area during 1965, an increase of 4,272 over 1964. The FBI report said there were more than 2,750,000 serious crimes in the United States during 1965.

ANNUAL COST, $1 BILLION

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover noted that the national cost of crime was "staggering." There were more than 5,600 murders, 34,700 aggravated assaults with a gun, and more than 68,400 robberies. Thieves stole goods valued in excess of $1 billion, Hoover said.

The national statistics showed increases in every category in the crime index. The District exceeded the national averages by substantial margins in 5 of the 7 FBI categories.

District murders and manslaughter were up 12.1 percent, compared to the national increase of 6.5 percent. Forcible rapes increased 45.8 percent, compared to the national increase of 9.3 percent.

D.C. robberies jumped up by 22 percent, compared to 6.4 percent nationally; burglaries were up 10.9 percent with a 5.7 percent national hike; and larcenies of $50 and more increased 18 percent in Washington, compared to the U.S. increase of 8.2 percent.

Washington had only a 1.15 percent increase in aggravated assaults, compared to the national percentage of 6.1, and reported a 4.2 increase in auto thefts, as compared to a 5.1 percent nationwide increase.

CRIME UP IN SUBURBS

Of the 51,947 crimes reported in the Washington area, 25,462 were committed in the District. This was an increase of 2,530, with burgary, robbery, and larcency showing the greatest numerical increases.

The balance of the area crimes were committed in the suburban areas, reflecting what the FBI report said is the target of "the sharpest upward trend" in crime throughout the nation. Crime in the suburbs increased by 8 percent in the country, the FBI said.

In the entire Washington Metropolitan area there were four more murder and manslaughter cases in 1965 than in 1964; 72 more forcible rapes, 698 more robberies, 743 more aggravated assaults, 1,304 more burglaries and 1,495 more larcenies of $50 and up.

Hoover said that since 1960, the total volume of serious crimes reported in the nation has increased by 46 percent, with violent crimes rising by 35 percent, and crimes against property increasing by 47 percent.

The director said crime "continues to outpace the population growth almost 6 to 1. While crime in the past five years increased by 46 percent, the population went up only 8 percent, Hoover said.

Arrests for all criminal acts have increased by 10 percent in the five-year period, but arrests for the most serious crimes increased by 33 percent. Last year, there were 3.7 arrests per 100 persons residing in the nation.

YOUTH ARRESTS RISE

The FBI reported that the involvement of persons under 18 years old in crimes continued its upward surge in 1965, with these young persons making up 21 percent of the arrests nationwide. In suburban communities, this percentage was even higher at 32.

"While arrest figures disclose a high percentage of juvenile involvement in crime, it must not be overlooked that a relatively small percentage of the total young age population become involved in criminal acts—less than 5 out of 100," Hoover said.

The FBI reported that a study of 130,000 offenders disclosed they have an average criminal career of 10 years during which they average five arrests.

During 1965, the report said, the nation's police were able to solve 25 percent of the serious crimes. The FBI said 91 percent of the murders were cleared up by arrest, 64 percent of the forcible rapes, 73 percent of the aggravated assaults and 38 percent of the robberies.

Crimes in which victims generally do not confront offenders such as burglaries, larceny and auto theft, showed lower clearance rates.

"The increasing volume of these property crimes and resulting heavy police workloads are also factors in the reduced police clearance rate," Hoover said.

CRIME INDEX FOR DISTRICT

FBI uniform crime index statistics for Washington showing changes between 1964 and 1965, and comparing with percentage of change with the national trend.

Offense	1964	1965	Numerical change	Percent of change	U.S. percent of change
Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	132	148	+16	+12.1	+6.5
Forcible rape	96	140	+44	+45.8	+9.3
Robbery	2,279	2,881	+602	+22	+6.4
Aggravated assault	2,605	2,635	+30	+1.15	+6.1
Burglary	8,910	9,886	+976	+10.9	+5.7
Larceny, $50 and up	3,518	4,153	+635	+18	+8.2
Auto theft	5,392	5,619	+227	+4.2	+5.1
Total index	22,932	25,462	2,530	+11	+6.3

A Republican Approach to the Needs of the Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, because of the continuing and alarming rise in the cost of living, I favor congressional action for automatic increases in social security and railroad benefits.

The Republican coordinating committee has prepared an excellent report on the need and precedent for such an increase and I ask that excerpts from that report be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A REPUBLICAN APPROACH TO THE NEEDS OF THE AGING

(An extract from Republican Coordinating Committee report on cost-of-living increases in social security and railroad retirement)

The Republican Coordinating Committee recommends that the Social Security Act and the Railroad Retirement Act be amended to provide an automatic cost of living increase in the insurance benefits payable thereunder.

Congress has not been entirely unmindful of the impact of cost of living increases on Social Security pensions and has periodically increased them. Provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act raise benefits under that program to correspond with Social Security increases. But between these sporadic increases there has usually been a time lag of several years during which the pensioners have suffered from a drop in their purchasing power. For example, from 1958 through 1964, just before the 7% increase in pensions was legislated, inflation cost Social Security pensioners approximately $1.4 billion in loss of purchasing power.

There is a precedent for such a provision as here recommended. Congress, in the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, Sec. 1102, provides for an automatic increase in Civil Service retirement pensions when there has been an increase of 3% or more in the consumer retail price index.

An automatic increase in Social Security and Railroad Retirement benefits correlated to increases in the consumer price index involve no increase in costs as a level percentage of payroll. Wage increases usually precede increases in the other components comprising the consumer price index. Increases in the wage level bring more covered workers nearer the maximum Social Security wage base and thus result in increased tax revenues. Additionally, the benefits paid represent a smaller proportion of an individual's wages as his wages approach the maximum wage limit ($6,000). Because of these factors, there is no increase in the level cost of payroll (although there is an increased flow of dollars) involved in enacting an automatic benefit increase provision.

There is an urgent need for such a change in the law. Why should aged pensioners continue to suffer while run-away inflation further destroys the purchasing power of the pension dollar? Congress should provide for an automatic offset against the hardship inflation and its resulting rise in prices visit upon our senior citizens.

An American Mother and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the Michigan Legislature by concurrent resolution has commended a constituent of mine, Mrs. Keith E. Mino, for her efforts in a successful community campaign to collect soap for the people of Vietnam. Mrs. Mino has a son, Keith, Jr., now serving in Vietnam with the U.S. Marine Corps. We can be proud of this American mother.

It gives me great pleasure to insert in the RECORD, House Concurrent Resolution 198 of the Michigan Legislature.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 198

A concurrent resolution of commendation for Mrs. Keith E. Mino and the U.S. Marine Corps.

Whereas Mrs. Keith E. Mino, of Mark Twain Avenue in Detroit, upon seeing photographs of American servicemen bathing Vietnamese children as part of the Civic Action Program of the Third Marine Amphibious Force in Viet Nam and learning of their need for soap, was motivated to collect soap for Vietnamese children as a neighborly gesture of friendship across the sea. Her door-to-door requests were so enthusiastically received that the drive became a community campaign, with volunteer groups among the schools, Parent-Teacher Associations, Boy and Girl Scouts, Cubs and Brownies, and others too numerous to mention, collecting and stockpiling soap bars of all descriptions. Other Michigan communities adopted the campaign in areas for which, presently, there are not full details available; and

Whereas the Marine Corps recruiting offices in the metropolitan area agreed to accept contributions for Mrs. Mino's collection, and when several tons were collected the soap was shipped to the Third Marine Amphibious Force in Viet Nam for use in the Civic Action Program, dispatched in the name of the citizens of Detroit and its suburbs; and

Whereas certainly these acts of goodwill significantly demonstrate the ever flourishing, heartwarming gestures of American empathy and generosity, and the power of those qualities, properly channeled, can exert: now therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Michigan Legislature, by these presents speaking for themselves and for the People of the State of Michigan, commend Mrs. Keith E. Mino, of Detroit, the United States Marine Corps, the Third Marine Amphibious Force in Viet Nam for its Civic Action Program of aid to Vietnamese civilians, and all of the individuals, groups, and organizations who so generously supported and contributed to the soap donations for Vietnamese children; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution of commendation be transmitted to Mrs. Keith Mino and to the United States Marine service organizations herein cited, that they may have this enduring testimony of appreciation and commendation by The Michigan Legislature.

Adopted by the House January 20, 1966.

T. THOS. THATCHER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the Senate January 26, 1966.

EUGENE B. FARNUM,
Secretary of the Senate.

U.S.S. "Henry L. Stimson"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a progress report from Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover concerning our newest Polaris, the U.S.S. *Henry L. Stimson*. Because Admiral Rickover describes the distinguished career of Mr. Stimson so eloquently I ask leave to include the letter in the RECORD at this point.

U.S.S. "HENRY L. STIMSON"
(SSBN) 655,
At Sea, North Atlantic, July 4, 1966.

DEAR MR. MOORHEAD: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of our thirty-eighth Polaris nuclear submarine. The U.S.S. *Henry L. Stimson* was built by the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corporation, Groton, Connecticut. We also have in operation twenty-three attack type nuclear submarines, making a total of sixty-one. This ship is named for Henry L. Stimson (1867–1950), a man of notable achievements both in his vocation, the private practice of the law, and in his avocation which was public service of the appointive kind.

Born in New York City, son of a distinguished surgeon, Stimson received his education at Andover, Yale and Harvard Law School. He was only twenty-five when Elihu Root took him into partnership. The young lawyer learned much from association with this commanding figure in the legal profession of whom it was said that he had been connected with every important case in New York since 1880. Root, who became a lifelong friend and mentor, taught him not only a highly effective trial technique emphasizing painstaking preparation, close reasoning and systematic ordering of arguments—intellectual habits that proved useful to Stimson in the varied positions he later filled with great distinction—but living and working in Root's office, as he later remarked, also made him aware of "the importance of the active performance of his public duties by a citizen of New York." Though his steadily expanding practice kept him busy, Stimson found time to participate energetically in local and state politics, his chief interest being better government.

In 1906 Theodore Roosevelt appointed him to his first public office, that of U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York. Thereafter and until he finally retired in 1945 at seventy-eight, Stimson took frequent leave of absence from his lucrative private practice to assume public duties, serving under every President except Woodrow Wilson and Warren G. Harding. He was the first to sit in the cabinet of *four* Presidents (two Republicans and two Democrats): as Secretary of War under William H. Taft, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, and as Secretary of State under Herbert Hoover. He served Calvin Coolidge as adviser on Latin American affairs, peacemaker in Nicaragua and Governor General of the Philippine Islands.

All his public offices, except one, were appointive and came to him unsought. Stimson had no flair for politics of the elective kind. He lost his bid for Governor of New York in 1908. The only election he won was for delegate at large to the New York Constitutional Convention of 1915. There he worked tirelessly for reforms that would give the State a more honest and efficient government. Although in that year's election the voters rejected the revised Constitution, by 1936 almost eighty percent of the proposed amendments had become part of New York's fundamental law and thirty other States had followed suit.

Politically, Stimson was identified with the reform or progressive element in the Republican Party. His views on government were formed early in life and changed very little. They are set forth in the autobiographical book, "On Active Service in Peace and War," written conjointly with McGeorge Bundy and published shortly before Stimson's death at eighty-three. "His basic convictions were two—first that the primary and overriding requirement of all government was that it should not infringe the essential liberties of the individual, and second, that within this limitation government could and must be made a powerful instrument of positive action." The restraint imposed by law on government in the interest of "the primary and essential liberties of the individual" was, to Stimson, "a fundamental principle of any decent society. But to construe this respect for personal freedom into an assertion that all government was evil seemed to him absurd." He felt that "in the industrial civilization of the twentieth century it was the duty of government to provide for the general welfare wherever no private agency could do the job."

Given this point of view, Stimson could serve Theodore Roosevelt loyally as U.S. Attorney and Franklin D. Roosevelt equally loyally as Secretary of War. Under the Republican Roosevelt, his task was enforcement of federal laws which had been enacted to protect our society against harmful actions of large and powerful private organizations; under the Democratic Roosevelt, his task was mobilization of the country's industrial potential in support of a war we fought against powerful nations threatening our free society. He accomplished both tasks extremely well.

Stimson's private work made him rich (he remained throughout his active life a member of the firm which originally had been headed by Root), but he derived his deepest satisfaction from the public services which supplemented and at frequent intervals replaced his private activities. He once told friends that the life of an "ordinary New York lawyer" could never wholly satisfy him since it was "primarily and essentially devoted to the making of money." Stimson shared with his father a desire to serve some larger cause than his own well-being.

The elder Stimson was a first-rate surgeon but had little interest in building the profitable private practice his talents could so easily have won him. Instead, he gave all his time to hospital work, much of it devoted to the charity cases that came to him as attending surgeon at the Chambers Street House of Relief, the emergency unit of New York Hospital. He liked to quote a famous French surgeon who said he preferred the poor for his patients since God was their paymaster.

Henry L. Stimson, the son, found that when he became U.S. Attorney, thus defender of the public interest and of the people, his work had an ethical content that enormously increased the satisfactions he derived in his professional life. Now he could do something to help redress a deplorable situation he found all too common: whenever private interests came into legal conflict with public interests, whenever great public issues put "a rich corporation on one side and only the people on the other," the side of the people usually "went by default," since so few successful lawyers were "putting their shoulders to the public wheel."

There can be little doubt that ancestry had something to do with Stimson's strong sense of civic responsibility. Nearly all his forebears were of New England stock, having arrived before 1650. After the Revolution they migrated westward and took up land in upper New York State. Hardworking, thrifty, self-reliant and strongly identified with their community, they fought in every war in which the country was embroiled (even as Stimson volunteered in the Spanish-American War and World War I) and produced, as he put it, "enough clergymen and deacons to keep up fairly well the moral standards of the stock."

In a more direct sense, Stimson's devotion to public service was an outgrowth of his concept of the function of law and advocacy in a democratic society. This comes out clearly in his autobiography where he describes how he came "to learn and understand the noble history of the profession of the law," and "to realize that without a bar trained in the tradition of courage and loyalty our constitutional theories of individual liberty would cease to be a living reality." He was much impressed by the experience of countries with constitutions and bills of rights not unlike our own where liberty was lost because they had no "bar with sufficient courage and independence to establish those rights by a brave assertion of the writs of habeas corpus and certiorari," and he came to feel strongly that every "American lawyer should regard himself as a potential officer of his government and a defender of its laws and constitution," for "if the time should ever come when this tradition had faded out and the members of the bar had become merely the servants of business, the future of our liberties would be gloomy indeed."

As as lawyer, Stimson brought to public office the special qualities that characterize the "professional man"; qualities that distinguish him from the "organization man" whose metier is "pure" administration. They are qualities extraordinarily valuable in a public servant, yet increasingly difficult to find in this age of giant organizations when it is common practice to fill high government posts with men whose careers have been the management of large private organizations. There is always a danger that private organizational loyalties may consciously or unconsciously influence such men in their public work; that they may in a sense think of themselves as ambassadors from the private to the public area. Stimson, who had a law practice awaiting him after each venture into public life, was bound by no conflicting loyalties. He could and did bring total dedication to every public task he assumed.

He had the professional man's respect for technical expertise; this led him to take infinite pains collecting able men to assist him whenever he took an a new post. He did not glibly assume that all it takes to improve an organization is to put a capable administrator at its head who will then issue orders that will *make* it "efficient." Nor did he believe in blind obedience to commands emanating from superiors on the administrative totem pole; he had the professional man's habit of acting upon his own considered judgment and of according other professionals the same right. Of his service in World War II, Robert H. Ferrell wrote that "no few words or easy statement can indicate the labor that produced an American Army and sent it over the world. Stimson's contribution was to put brains at the center of the War Department, to create a situation in which men of intelligence and knowledge could work together without feeling that whatever they did would be cancelled by some ignoramus higher up the chain of command." Finally, Stimson had the professional man's commitment to a personal code of ethics. Nobody believed more strongly than he in a cabinet member's loyalty to his President but he never hesitated to stand up to a presidential action he thought wrong. A notable example was his insistence in opposing Franklin D. Roosevelt's approval of the Morgenthau Plan which would have stripped Germany of her industrial plant and turned her into an agricultural country.

The services public servants in high appointive office are expected to render the nation are not unlike the services a competent and responsible professional man renders his client. Thus, it is not surprising that the qualities Stimson possessed as a professional man should have made him an outstanding public servant. He was, as his biographer Elting E. Morison wrote, "a forthright gentleman, a great trial lawyer, a courageous soldier, a dedicated public servant, a statesman who would live in grateful hearts."

Respectfully,

H. G. Rickover.

The Honorable William S. Moorhead,
U.S. House of Representatives.

Homebuilding Industry Slump

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, due to ill-advised Johnson administration policies interest rates are the highest in 40 years. As a result the homebuilding and selling industry faces a major crisis which adversely affects millions of Americans. Absence of mortgage money has resulted in the building permit rate dropping 18 percent as against a year ago, and applications for FHA-insured mortgage loans on existing homes are down 34 percent.

Newly married couples are unable to buy homes. Families who need to sell their houses cannot find buyers. Builders and workers in the home construction and related industry are suffering from the slump. The Pacific Northwest lumber industry is hurt by this building recession.

The problem is that the rising demand for credit by the Federal Government and business has siphoned off funds from industries such as home financing. Meanwhile, plant and inventory expansion continues at a record pace as a hedge against the inflationary cost increase spiral.

Mr. Speaker, the only remedy offered by the administration's low-interest advocates has been a statutory interest rate ceiling over time deposits in banks and savings and loan associations. The Treasury Department according to the press opposes such a 4.5-percent limitation on interest rates.

The suggestions of the House Republican Policy Committee, of which I am a member, to meet the crisis consist of several stern measures:

First. Slash nondefense, nonessential domestic spending. Not just in regard to appropriations as the President has urged, but also with respect to new program authorizations which trigger the appropriations process.

Second. Reduce point discounts on FHA and VA home financing through administrative adjustments of rates to more realistic levels. Five and six point discounts—$1,500 on a $25,000 home mortgage—are stifling home financing and wiping out personal savings.

Third. Suspend any further issues of FNMA participation sales other than for VA and FHA pooled housing mortgages. When the participation sales bill was being debated, we warned that this multibillion-dollar budgetary gimmick would place severe strains on the private credit market and push up interest rates to record levels. Experience with the program has fully confirmed our fears.

Fourth. Enact the Republican-initiated proposal to grant FNMA additional borrowing authority in a prudent and legal manner.

Fifth. Remove FNMA's $15,000 administrative limitation on purchase of mortgages under its secondary market operations.

Sixth. Appoint an emergency Presidential factfinding committee on the homebuilding crisis to report its findings in sufficient time for congressional consideration prior to adjournment of the 89th Congress, and prior to the November election.

Mr. Speaker, the main cause of the stringency in money for loans is the swollen budget of the President and the excessive spending programs advocated by his administration.

All the while some of us in Congress have been urging drastic cuts in nonessential Government spending.

Administration policies caused this money crisis. However, Mr. Speaker, we of the minority stand ready and willing to support sound remedies. Home building and selling is the second largest industry in the country. It is vital to the economy that immediate steps be taken, such as those I have mentioned, to curb inflation and ease money for loans to homeowners.

Student Response to Adult Basic Education Act in Connecticut, 1965–66

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to my colleagues' attention several humble statements of gratitude and expectation by persons who have been participating in Connecticut's adult basic education program. It is encouraging to find this response which can be directly attributed to the opportunities offered by title IIb of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The statements collected by Mr. James Dorsey, consultant for adult basic education in Connecticut, follow:

Student Response to Adult Basic Education in Connecticut 1965–66

"The reason I am going to nite school is because of more learning. The more learning is more gain in higher salaries, better living conditions, easier way of life. It helps in easier understanding of human relations with the moderate people. It takes the worry out of life."—Middletown.

"I been blind for many year. When you can not read you are blind. I been fight for an education for long time."—Leo Merris, Middletown.

"I really like adult school and you ask me about my opinion about it. It is a great thing for anybody like myself who did not have the opportunity and now at the age of 46 years of age, coming up in years, whenever I apply for a job, the first thing they will say to me is 'Mr. Daniels, how far did you go in school', and I will say the 4th grade, that I would be willing to work, and they would not even listen to me, they will say, 'you don't have the education, and you would at least have to have a high school education for the job'. Even at the plant where I am employed, even if I bid on a job, with my background, I can't get the job. But a person like me or any grown up should be compelled to go and get the education. Just like the cildren when their parents tell them to do something, but an adult doesn't have to go if they don't want to, but the main reason is that anyone in the U.S.A. can see that someone can come from any other country and get a better job as an American, and that is my reason why I am trying and while I like the adult school, it is one of the best things in the U.S.A."—Edward Daniels, Ansonia.

"I have always had a great yearning to learn and I wanted very much to profit all I could from my school years—Unfortunately, adverse circumstances interrupted my studies a few times and finally needed it all in my first year of high school. When I came to this country, I went back to school, this time to learn to speak and understand the English language and to read as well as write it, but the English grammar, its vocabulary and many rules were all unknown to me and so was American History, the English explanation of mathematics, etc.—so, I really welcome the opportunity the Adult Program offered me. We have excellent teachers who seem to make learning easy and surely make it very interesting! My gratitude goes to our teachers and all others responsible for this rare second chance."—[No signature.]

"I want to get a good job. My class is interesting. I learn many things that help me. I come from Poland with my family. I like United States of America. God Bless America."—Jermie Plonowski, Stamford.

"I have enrolled in Adult Basic Education because I know I didn't have a good education as a child, and now I have the opportunity to improve my education. To acquire more knowledge, most of all one never has enough education and you learn something new every day because education goes on forever. This class has been of value to me. I've learned a little more and I know a little more than when I first started so if and when I'd like to go further in my education."—Josephine Kazinur, Middletown.

"I am taking this course because I don't have learning I should have. I have four children and three of them is in school and when they come home with a problem I can't help them at all."—Willie C. Preston, Stamford.

"I enrolled in Adult Education because I got tired of not being able to communicate with people, both in writing and speaking. And also to be able to improve in my job at work. This class has improved my mental outlook on life in the short time I have been going. I only wish I had started years ago, but I intend to continue on. It's just too bad that more people like myself stay at home and just think about going to school."—Antone Medeiros, Middletown.

"I will like to learn English to continue advance courses and to become a nurse in the future. I will like know better the customs of the American people."—Aniporo Gutierrez, Stamford..

"I enrolled in the Adult Basic Education Program to improve my English. I am at present working at A. H. Prison, Inc. as an exchange student in horticulture. I'll stay 18 months in the United States and then return to West-Germany. The evening classes helped me to learn better English, so that I'm able to read trade papers and newspapers. For my studies in the horticulture field it is necessary to understand English. Besides this is the English language very important when you travel. No matter where you go, the first question is always 'do you speak English'? I love to travel and this is another reason why I wanted to improve my English. Besides the spoken word, I want to learn to write so that I can write to all my friends in the years to come."—Lothar Korfge, Middletown.

"I come for help here. And I have received very good help so far—thank you."—Mrs. Hazel C. Lewis, Stamford.

"I have the desire to become a beauty operator and you have to complete eight years of grade school, so my social worker instructed me to contact this school to see if it's possible to finish my course and enter by July of '66 which I only had two months to finish during that time."—Virginia Felton, New Haven.

"When I decided that I would go back to school I didn't think that I would continue as long as I did. Now I can read and write much better than before. I like my teacher very much. He is a wonderful teacher. Most of all he trys to help each one of us to understand our work."—James Antrum, Seymour.

"I came to Evening School because I want to learn to speak, write and read English. I live in Bridgeport and I must speak English well. I like to live in a free country. At Evening School, I have a good time. Each lesson helps me to speak and understand the English language. I must listen to the radios and look at television, and understand what is going on. America is a nation of many people and they speak English. I was recently ordained a priest. In America, living is good, because people are good."—John Borowik, Bridgeport.

"I enrolled in Adult Basic Education because I want to learn the laws of U.S.A. I want to learn to write and read English better. When I learn more English I will try to get a better job. I wish to learn all about the U.S. The class has been of value to me because I have learned to read, write and speak English. I like school very much."—Jose Martins, Bridgeport.

"Because since I am living in America I would like to learn the English language. Another reason I enrolled is because I have three intelligent sons in school who urged me to enroll. The oldest will graduate this Monday from Notre Dame High School, the second oldest is a member of the National Honor Society at Notre Dame High School and the third is in Grammar School. If I learned English I would make a good citizen of the United States, and would be a better speaker of the English. I have very much enjoyed coming to Night School, and will continue to do so as far as I am able to."—Ontonui Ramadanovic, Bridgeport.

"I come to Night School to learn how to read and write English. And if I live long enough I will learn it because I loved it. The English language is based on Latin. Clear pure Latin. And I enjoy is beautiful. I think is the early Christian language. To me is treasure. I am a naturalized citizen and I enjoy attending Evening School."—Arthur, Goda, Bridgeport.

"I have been in the United States only one year. Night School has helped me to understand and speak English well enough so that I am make myself understand. I am able to carry on a conversation easily. When I started school I could not shop easily in the stores. Now I am able to express myself and tell the clerk exactly what I want."—Chrysoula Vlamis, Bridgeport.

"I came to Evening School because I want to learn about the English language and about the American History. I like a Democracy and freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press and freedom of search. Good English is important in my every day life. I need good English at my job. This country helps me to have freedom and happiness."—Tadeusi Bednarczyk, Bridgeport.

"Because I am curious about all things, I love to know more and learn about them. Teacher, test, homework, give me the necessary push I need to work at it, which I do not have otherwise. Also, I had no education in English grammar, history, etc. This is a very important reason. I also have a boy in the 5th grade who needs my help at times and I want to be able to do so. He will probably go to college—so I feel, the more I know, the better I will understand him and his problems."—Laurette R. Jancarski, Middletown.

"I enrolled at night school because I want to learn to get my driver's license and was able to do so with the help of my schooling. I want to be able to pick up the newspaper and read it. My schooling also helped me get a job. I have learned to write many things that I was not able to do before. I feel as though I learned more in my first year because I had a lot more help at home."—Violet Gastomski, Stamford.

Federal Maritime Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill, as an amendment to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to create a Federal Maritime Administration as an entirely separate and independent agency, to be administered by a bipartisan Board of three members to be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation, each of whom shall serve staggered 4-year terms and not more than two of whom shall belong to the same political party.

This action is necessary if we are to salvage and restore the American merchant marine as a vital adjunct of the national economy and an indispensable element of naval strength.

The merchant marine has become the stepchild of the Federal Government and subject to Executive whim. In two world wars we have shown that we can outbuild and outship any other nation in the world. After each war, we have put our ships into mothballs or sold them on a giveaway basis to supposedly friendly foreign nations, until today, as in the past, there is danger that the American flag will be worsted in world trade.

Between the wars, our merchant marine is passed around and parceled out between various Government agencies, and it is now proposed to put it under the new Department of Transportation to take its chances with the wreck of the New Haven Railroad and with the airlines, barges, and buslines.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that experience shows that the only assurance that our merchant marine will not be sacrificed to the whim of the diplomatic cooky-pushers and bureaucrats or to the convenience of competing forms of transportation, will be to place it once and for all under an agency established by Congress for the express purpose of maintaining the American merchant fleet, manned by American sailors and flying the American flag in service on the high seas.

The Russians make no effort to conceal their purpose to enlarge their merchant shipping and to keep it under their national control. In this connection, with unanimous consent, I adduce an article by Mark Hopkins published in the Staten Island Sunday Advance of July 10. This article is titled "Soviets Expand Cargo Fleet, May Surpass United States by 1970." It points out that since 1951, the Soviet Union has moved from eighth to fourth place among the world's merchant marine fleets, with an estimated 1,200 Russian tankers and freighters now plying international trade routes. By 1970 the Russians may nearly double this figure.

In ironic contrast to this picture of Russian expansion on the high seas is the spectacle of American liberty ships built in this country during the war and sold at a cheap price to so-called friendly nations after the war, being used in free world trade with our Communist enemies in Cuba and North Vietnam. The State Department's tissue-paper blacklist consists of a slap on the wrist for vessels engaged in such trade. They may not touch at our ports unless the owner promises not to do it again with that particular vessel. Authority for these statements is an article which asks "How Effective Is Our Blacklist of Ships Doing Business with Cuba and North Vietnam?" written by Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Baltimore Sun, and published in the July 1966 issue of Navy, the magazine of Sea Power, an official publication of the Navy League of the United States.

With unanimous consent I introduce a copy of this disturbing article. What a travesty. Here are the very ships we sold at giveaway prices to our wartime Allies, in order to help them get their merchant marines going after the war, being used to violate the American economic quarantine of Communist aggression in Cuba on our doorstep and to supply the Vietcong halfway around the world. And here is Russia grimly pressing ahead with plans to double her merchant fleet, while the only use we can find for our mothballed Victory ships is in time of such brushfire wars as Korea and Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, all history and all human experience have shown that the nation which is weak at sea is weak everywhere, and that the foundation of national prosperity is the possession of a merchant marine which can carry our goods to market and buy what we need abroad without asking permission of foreign competitors. The American merchant marine has been that to us in the past, as it has been the steadfast partner of our naval power and our economic growth. It can—it must—be preserved, maintained, and expanded. The purpose of my bill is to do just that.

[From the Staten Island Sunday Advance, July 10, 1966]

Soviets Expand Cargo Fleet, May Surpass United States by 1970

(By Mark Hopkins, special to the Advance)

For the first time in two-and-a-half centuries Russia is striving to become a world sea power.

The difference between Czar Peter the Great's quest and that of the nuclear age Soviet leadership, however, is that Russia is likely to succeed this time.

Since 1951, the Soviet Union has moved from eighth to fourth place among the world's merchant marine fleets, ranked by number of ships.

An estimated 1,260 Soviet tankers and freighters now ply international trade routes.

By 1970, the Soviet Union may nearly double this figure.

According to the American Merchant Marine Institute, which is both alarmed at the rapid growth of the Soviet merchant fleet and is interested in expanding the American, the Soviet Union would then be a greater maritime power than the United States.

Soviet naval power too, is gaining respect. Recently, Sen. Stuart Symington, D-Mo. asserted that Soviet cruisers and submarines, both armed with nuclear missiles, were becoming increasingly prevalent in the Mediterranean Sea and represented a threat to Europe.

The Soviet submarine fleet, now estimated at 400 craft, has attracted special attention.

Last April, Marshal Rodion Malinovsky, Soviet defense minister, revealed that a squadron of nuclear powered submarines had just completed a six-week, world-circling trip.

His report emphasized the commonplace—that Soviet nuclear submarines, as well as American, can roam the oceans as missile launching stations.

One or more Soviet nuclear submarines reportedly are stationed 1,000 miles off both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the United States full time.

The Soviet Union is believed to have 40 to 45 nuclear-powered underseas warships, compared with 62 Americans. The Institute of Strategic Studies in London, which makes the lower estimate, reported in November that the Soviet Union had added 10 nuclear submarines during 1965.

In its nuclear-powered underseas fleet the Soviet Union has 25 missile firing submarines. These are supplemented by 75 conventionally powered craft that also fire missiles.

The remainder of the submarine fleet consists of attack ships, for use against surface craft of submarines.

Other ships in the 450,000 man Soviet navy include 20 cruisers and about 270 escort craft. The American navy has 31 cruisers, 591 escort vessels and 38 aircraft carriers, of which the Soviet Union has none.

Although Soviet naval power is the more glamorous and immediate topic, the merchant marine has greater long range importance in the Soviet drive to be a world sea power.

Its maritime growth is a signal event. For centuries, the Russian state was essentially a landlocked giant situated too far north for easy access to ice-free waters.

A respected school of western historians argues that behind Russian expansion into the south, toward the Black Sea and northwest, toward the Baltic, and finally to the far east, toward the Pacific Ocean, was a yearning for warm water ports.

Soviet merchant ships now sail from three major ports—Odessa on the Black Sea, Leningrad on the Gulf of Finland, and Vladivostok on the Pacific Coast, and from several smaller ones. Even Odessa, located in a warm zone, must be kept open by ice breakers part of the year.

The growth of the Soviet merchant fleet since World War II was slow until the mid-1950's. There, in a concentrated program of shipbuilding and buying, the fleet grew impressively to the present 1,260 vessels of 8.6-million tons deadweight—a measure of cargo capacity.

By 1970, the Sovet Union may have 2,000 merchant ships, according to the Merchant Marine Institute's estimate, totaling 16-million tons.

The Soviet Union is expanding its own shipbulding yards, which currently are producing 145 tankers and freighters. However, it also has awarded lucrative contracts to foreign yards, particularly Japan's and these are constructing 319 ships for the Soviet Union.

At present more merchant ships—24 per cent of the total under construction or on order world-wide—are being added to the Soviet fleet than to any commercial fleet in the world.

To some in the West, the Soviet maritime growth at this rate portends Soviet domination of the high seas. Rep. Paul Rogers, D-Fla., who has campaigned for a larger American merchant marine proclaims on the House floor last year.

"The Soviet Union may soon be able to manipulate world ocean freight rates at will, and through a superiority in terms of numbers of ships, she may be well on the road to economic domination of the world."

Others in the West are less disturbed. Besides Japan, shipyards in Italy, France, Finland and Denmark have accepted orders to construct merchant vessels for the Soviet Union.

The Soviet minister of the merchant marine, Victor Bakayev, acknowledged in an interview with a Soviet newspaper correspondent that the Soviet merchant fleet would have a significant effect on world shipping.

He contended, however, that the Soviet Union hoped simply to meet its own shipping needs, "not to seize control of international shipping."

The Soviet Union argues that it has had to pay out foreign exchange to foreign shippers to transport increasingly large Soviet exports and imports. With its own merchant fleet, it can reduce this expenditure and make money.

Its growing passenger fleet—now more than 50 liners—is also a means of income. The most recent addition was the Alexander Pushkin, which opened direct Soviet-North American passenger service in April when it pulled into Montreal.

Whatever its motivation, the Soviet Union is churning into the ranks of the world's maritime powers.

How Effective Is Our Blacklist of Ships Doing Business With Cuba and North Viet Nam?—Not Very, Author Concludes—British Are Chief Offenders

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

While the United States' Ambassador to the United Nations fought vigorously for passage by the Security Council of the toughest economic sanctions ever voted by the U.N. in order to support Great Britain's stand against Rhodesia's defiant government, more British-flag ships were being added to America's blacklist for calling both at Cuba and North Viet Nam.

The addition of the British vessels to these blacklists—inaugurated by the United States against two countries it considers real enemies—is nothing unusual, because ships flying the Union Jack head both lists.

But it points up the ironic—almost ridiculous—situation of the United States as far as international shipping is concerned.

Perhaps this was best illustrated in a cartoon printed recently in a Western newspaper. The drawing depicts a British navy captain on the bridge of his frigate looking through a telescope. On a nearby chart is marked a big "success" for having diverted a Greek-flag tanker bound for Mozambique to deliver oil to Rhodesia. Passing directly in front of the Navy vessel is a British-flag tanker laden with Soviet MIGS on its deck and oil in its holds with the words "North Viet Nam" emblazoned on its sides.

"This one can go because it is not heading to our enemy," remarked the British captain.[1]

Ambassador Arthur Goldberg led a Security Council sit-in until the economic sanctions were voted. Those sanctions call for Britain "to employ all measures including armed force" to crush the Rhodesian regime of Premier Ian Smith. Rhodesia is a (former) colony of Great Britain in a continent somewhat removed from the United Kingdom.

Compare this series of moves to Great Britain's response when the United States called upon the countries of the Free World to stop their ships from going to Cuba, which had become Communist-dominated and armed with Russian missiles only 90 miles from the shores of the United States. Britain's Government accused this country of trying to control the seas and declared Uncle Sam was interfering with the freedom of the seas.

The United Kingdom stated it would not attempt to halt its shipowners from serving Cuba. It obviously has not, since more British ships are regularly being added to the blacklist. Of the 251 Free World and Polish vessels now on the official Cuban blacklist, 72 are British.

---

[1] Of course, British ships are not delivering MIGs to North Viet Nam. The cartoonist exaggerated to make his point.

COULDN'T CARE LESS

But even more significant is the fact that British-flag ships have made 462 trips or nearly 45 per cent of the 1,157 voyages made to Cuba by Free World and Polish vessels since the United States inaugurated its blacklist on January 1, 1963.

Of the 10 ships on the North Viet Nam blacklist—which became effective as of January 25, 1966, months after the buildup in South Viet Nam was announced by President Johnson—seven are British. Great Britain has used the lame excuse that it cannot control the ships in Hong Kong. However, Greece did strip one of its tankers of its registry when it appeared in Beira with oil for Rhodesia.

When the United States protested Great Britain's sale of buses and other equipment to Cuba, the U.K. defied the protest and proceeded with the sale and shipment. Therefore, when it states that it cannot control the Hong Kong ships, there is a serious question whether Great Britain wants to.

Greece's stripping of the tanker's registry is another note of irony in the international shipping picture. Although the Greek Government has issued Royal Decrees forbidding any of its ships to call at Cuba or North Viet Nam, Greek-flag vessels still are going to both countries. Some 35 of the ships on the Cuban blacklist belong to Greece, while two of the 10 going to North Viet Nam also are registered in that Mediterranean country.

WORLD OPINION

It would appear that the only reason the Greek Government seized the registry of the *Joanna V* is because it had becbme an international issue with blazing headlines in every country in the world.

In January, the State Department reported that Free World ships trading with North Viet Nam had declined from 34 per month in 1964 to 13 per month in the latter part of 1965. The blacklist became effective as of January 25, 1966, and the number may have declined even further, although no other figures have been issued.

However, it has been said on Capitol Hill that many of the ships transporting goods to North Viet Nam no longer are going directly there, but discharging their cargoes in Hong Kong for transshipment to the Communist country.

Thomas W. Gleason, president of the International Longshoremen's Association (AFL–CIO), who has been working with United States Government officials to break the logjam in shipping in the Republic of Vietnam ports, told the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee that he has viewed English, Panamanian, Greek and other ships in Hong Kong, "supposedly bringing in cargo for Hong Kong."

"But this stuff," he continued, "would be transferred into the small coastal vessels operated either by Chinamen or a few North Vietnamese or Crown Colony ships, and brought down into Haiphong for final discharge there."

Soviet Union ships also are running from Hong Kong to Haiphong, according to Lloyd's Weekly Shipping Index.

Although the United States' blacklist as such is considered weak and somewhat inconsequential in this country, there is a definite principle which our friends are defying. It is considered weak because the only thing the blacklist does is prevent the ships listed thereon from calling at United States ports to pick up Government-financed cargoes.

However, these blacklisted ships can:

1. Pick up commercial cargoes in American ports, if the longshoremen will load them.
2. Pick up United States Government-financed (through counterpart funds) cargoes in foreign ports.

And then, of course, when the owner feels that his trips to Cuba or North Viet Nam are not as remunerative as they might be if he picks up U.S. aid cargo in American ports, all he has to do is sign a pledge that he'll never send that ship again to that area. Ninety-one vessels—including 39 British and 25 Greek—have been freed from the Cuba blacklist in this manner.

The International Longshoremen's Association (AFL–CIO) succeeded in imposing a more stringent boycott of ships serving Cuba for two years after the Cuban crisis, but it has waned somewhat because of the difficulty in keeping track of the ships.

UNION SHOWS WAY

But the ILA refused to handle the ships of any owner who might have had even a single ship calling at Cuba. The union boycott went into effect three months before the U.S. government did anything officially.

Likewise in the case of North Viet Nam, the maritime unions began pressing to boycott or bar ships from the United States long before any official action was taken. Various Congressmen picked up their complaints and introduced legislation which would do everything from preventing such ships from ever calling at the United States again to stopping any ship from any country which had a single vessel going to North Viet Nam from calling in an American port. These bills are languishing on Capitol Hill and probably will never see daylight.

Even when Congress passed an amendment to the foreign aid bill that prevented doling out any money to any nation whose ships were calling at Cuba, the Executive Department chose to ignore that order.

When the State Department first decided to lift the blacklist from the ships of owners who "took the pledge" not to send the ship into Cuba again (a similar pledge is available in the instance of North Viet Nam), the longshoremen refused to go along and clear these ships.

The test case was the SS *Tulse Hills*, an American-built Liberty sold after the war to help rehabilitate the Greek merchant marine and subsequently switched to British registry by the Mavroleon Kulukundis interests when they headquartered in London.

The *Tulse Hills* arrived in Baltimore shortly after the agreement was signed between Basil Mavroleon—whose combine had the most ships in the Cuban trade—and the State Department. Baltimore longshoremen—all members of the International Longshoremen's Association (AFL–CIO)—refused to load the grain aboard the vessel. The owners took the dockworkers to court and went up through the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, which concurred that no force could make an individual load a particular vessel or do a special job if he did not want to.

After 137 days of waiting the *Tulse Hills* departed from Baltimore without any fanfare and without its cargo. The dockworkers again proved that their "blacklist" was more potent than the Government's.

In addition to the Greek and British ships on the Cuba blacklist, there are 57 Lebanese, 18 Polish, 18 Cypriot, 14 Italian, 9 Yugoslav, 7 French, 5 Moroccan, 5 Maltese, 4 Finnish, 2 Dutch, 2 Norwegian, 2 Swedish, and one from Monaco.

A number of these have since changed their registry by the same owner or been sold to another owner and registered in another country. However, their new identity also is carried on the blacklist published regularly by the Maritime Administration. As a result, the current list includes such countries as South Africa, Panama, Guinea, Haiti, Liberia and Nationalist China.

MANY ARE U.S.-BUILT

There are many ironies in this blacklist-boycott picture. For instance, a substantial portion of the ships on the list are former Liberty vessels built in the United States during World War II and sold to the friendly nations at a cheap price to help them get their merchant marines going after the war. Both Panama and Liberia issued proclamations that no ships in their registry could serve Cuba and yet six have been transferred to those countries and now are appearing on the list.

A number of the ships registered in both Lebanon and Cyprus are owned by Greeks who are somewhat concerned that their own nation might seize their registries, so they charged over first. Lebanon and Cyprus can both be considered "flags of convenience," along with Panama, Liberia, and Honduras, for shipowners, although it is believed that no American shipowners have transferred any vessels to the Middle East area.

Some American shipping circles have expressed grave concern over the fact that the Security Council upheld London's position on the Rhodesian boycott so strongly. They note that morality of Britain's dispute with Rhodesia is one thing, but the morality of the kind of blockade-enforced boycott is another.

What would Great Britain's reaction be, they ask, if the United States should seek a similar boycott against both Cuba and North Viet Nam—a country with which American troops are at war and losing their lives?

DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

It also is noted that perhaps a dangerous precedent has been set and they ask what would happen if the situation should be reversed: A Communist-oriented power decided to apply heavy pressure on a neighbor friendly to the West, declares a boycott and then goes not to the Security Council but to the General Assembly of the United Nations for approval of stronger measures, including a blockade. The conclusion is that western maritime nations may find themselves in a most embarrassing position.

And the big question is whether Great Britain, with one of the largest mercantile fleets afloat, would defy the blockade in the same manner it has the blacklists of the United States?

University of California, Los Angeles, Gives Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws to Eric Wyndham White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Eric Wyndham White is truly one of the great international civil servants of this generation. I have seen him in action since the early 1950's when I first went to Geneva and the GATT negotiations. During recent years as a member of the U.S. delegation for trade negotiations I have had the opportunity to work closely with him and to admire his fairness, scholarship, and good judgment.

On June 9, 1966, the University of California, Los Angeles, gave to Eric Wyndham White an honorable degree of doctor of laws. The following is the text of the citation which was delivered when the degree was conferred:

> Distinguished lawyer, economist and Director-General of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—Eric Wyndham White has been instrumental in developing the princi-

pal organization for trade. . . . Under his guidance some seventy countries have accepted a code of practical rules for fair trading in international commerce and have cooperated on a global basis in lowering trade barriers. For his service to mankind . . . we salute him and confer upon him the University of California's highest honour.

Matthew Henson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in the Evening Star of July 28, 1966, the columnist, "The Rambler," wrote an excellent article about one of the authentic American heroes, Matthew Henson.

This distinguished explorer was with Admiral Peary when the latter discovered the North Pole in 1909. Many historians have even credited Mr. Henson with the actual discovery of the North Pole.

All of his life, Matthew Henson was a member of the church where I have pastored for 36 years, Abyssinian Baptist Church. Not only was he a devoted member, but gave generously of his time to the activities of Abyssinian.

His widow, Mrs. Henson, is still an active member of Abyssinian and her work is a continuing tribute to this great man.

In addition to the outstanding tribute the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, Senator Joseph Tydings, would pay him by introducing a bill to authorize Henson's burial in Arlington Cemetery, I am hopeful that a bill can be introduced to provide a small pension for Mrs. Henson in honor of the glory her husband helped to bring to the United States of America.

I am placing in the Record now the full column by "The Rambler" on Matthew Henson.

The Rambler Discovers a Hero

(By John McKelway)

Who was Matthew A. Henson?

He was born on Aug. 8, 1866, on a farm not far from Washington at a place called Nanjemoy, in Charles County. The farm was the site of a former slave market.

Not much is known about his boyhood. But at the age of 11, Henson ran away from home and made his way to Washington.

He stayed here with an aunt and worked in a restaurant she operated. He went to a school known as the N Street Elementary School, but his attendance was irregular.

Then, at the age of 13, he left his home again and walked all the way to Baltimore. He apparently was able to find some odd jobs on the waterfront and later picked up a job as a cabin boy on a schooner bound for China. The captain, a man named Childs, taught the youngster some mathematics and navigation.

Once back in the United States, he returned to Washington and this time found employment at a hat shop on Pennsylvania Avenue as a porter.

There must have been something unusual in his manner, the way he walked or talked or smiled. Something.

At any rate, a customer, the then Navy Lt. Robert E. Peary, struck up a friendship with the young Negro. Soon, Henson was on the high seas again, this time accompanying Peary on a canal surveying trip to Nicaragua.

By 1909, Peary was a commander and on April 6 of that year he entered the following note in a log book:

"90 N. Lat., North Pole . . . Arrived here today, 27 marches from Cape Columbia. I have with me 5 men, Matthew Henson, colored, Ootah, Eginwah, Seegloo and Oookeah, Eskimos; 5 sledges and 38 dogs.

"The expedition under my command has succeeded in reaching the Pole . . . for the honor and prestige of the United States of America."

And he reportedly said "This scene my eyes will never see again. Plant the Stars and Stripes over there, Matt . . . at the North Pole."

The more one reads of Henson, the more remarkable he seems. He accompanied Peary on seven expeditions to the Arctic and Polar regions and the explorer once said of him, "He is my most valuable companion. I could not get along without him."

While Peary had difficulty communicating with the Eskimos, Henson could speak the language fluently. He also became expert in building sleds, handling the huskies that pulled the men and equipment and in building igloos.

Without Henson, it appears Peary might never have made it. Henson once told a reporter:

"The morning of April 6th I found we were in the middle of hummock ice. I calculated about how far I had come, and I said to myself, 'If I'm not on the Pole, I've crossed it, so I don't have to go no further . . .

"Commander Peary was 45 minutes behind. He came up to us as we were building an igloo and he says, 'Well, my boy, how many miles have we made today?' 'Too many, Commander' I said, 'I think we crossed the Pole. So the Commander got out his notebook and figured a bit and he says, 'I guess you're right.' "

And he added, "The Commander was never a well man from the minute after he'd finished taking those observations at the Pole. It seemed to be an effort for him to speak.

"All his strength had been concentrated on getting to the Pole. Once he got there his strength gave out."

Henson died in 1955. He had done some lecturing after the trip to the Pole. But he was practically broke until he got a job in the Collector of Customs Office in New York. He retired in 1936.

Somewhat belatedly, he received a naval medal in 1945 and then, in 1950, was honored at the Pentagon on the 41st anniversary of the Pole conquest. For the last 16 years of his life, he lived in New York on an $85-a-month government pension. He died at the age of 88.

Just the other day, Sen. Joseph Tydings, D-Md., introduced a bill to permit Henson to be buried in Arlington Cemetery. He is buried in New York now.

Under terms of the legislation, Henson would be given a hero's burial.

The Uses of Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES P. FARNSLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, what may seem to be relatively unimportant measures can often lead to highly important benefits—and at the same time head off unwanted events.

The Washington Evening Star reports one such measure. It was taken by President Johnson in a phone call which turned on hydrant sprinklers, lighted up swimming pools at night, and provided portable pools for children of the District of Columbia to play in.

The Star's editorial on what it refers to as "an impressive demonstration of presidential power properly applied" is herewith offered for the Record:

The Uses of Water

Water is, most of all, for drinking. Second, it is for children to play in. Then come 1001 other uses, such as washing, cooking, putting out fires and holding up boats.

The recreational importance of water was officially recognized this week in Washington by no less a person than President Lyndon B. Johnson. And it has been a long time since any president has come up with a sounder decision.

The President's official position was made known in the form of a brief telephone call, expressing some displeasure over the leisurely pace at which the District was proceeding with the program to provide swimming facilities and, especially, sprinkler caps for fire hydrants in crowded downtown residential areas.

As he hung up, bales of red tape that had kept the program hog-tied for months suddenly vanished. High-powered federal and city officials huddled, and by mid-afternoon the program was well off the ground. The number of sprinklers nearly doubled; lights were ordered so that the city's pools could stay open after dark; more than a dozen portable pools became available.

It was an impressive demonstration of presidential power properly applied. The city's youths need and deserve all the swimming facilities that can possibly be provided. And the water-saving hydrant sprinklers, which convert hot, dirty streets into legitimate playgrounds, are clearly a good investment. Better than the steel helmets some other cities have provided to protect policemen who swarm in to turn off illegally gushing hydrants.

Thanks to that presidential phone call, Washington's summer will be less hot and less long than it might otherwise have been.

The Spiraling Costs of Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, the cost of education is hitting ever harder at the middle-income family today. The people who are willing to sacrifice to give their children a leg up in the world through education are being called upon to make ever greater sacrifices. The middle-income heart of the tax base in our Nation cannot take much more pressure, as the following editorial from the Denver Post aptly shows, through its comparison of the costs of education some years ago and now.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to call this body's attention once more to my bill, H.R. 16012, which would amend the

Higher Education Act of 1965 and the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 to raise the family income limitation with respect to Federal payments to reduce interest costs on insured student loans.

The editorial follows:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, July 26, 1966]

WE LIVE AND WE LEARN

The high cost of learning is graying a lot of parental heads nowadays as sons and daughters come of college age. September is just around the corner.

To some extent, at least, that was true a generation ago when our current moms and dads were pre-collegians themselves, just emerging from their high school cocoons.

How much did it cost to go to college then? Some surprising answers are listed in a little publication dated March, 1938, issued by a Denver savings and loan company. A friend just happened to find this booklet in his files.

"The cost as shown in these tables is not prohibitive," the booklet states, encouragingly. "Of course the tuition at 'name' universities is comparatively costly to families of average means. But there are many universities of high scholastic standing where tuition costs are moderate."

There follows a list of U.S. universities popular with persons in Denver and vicinity, giving the "average 4-year cost" including total amounts needed for tuition, room and board and incidentals. These averages, it says, "may be accepted as a practical basis for planning:"

Arizona	$3,300
Barnard	4,800
Bryn Mawr or Vassar	6,000
California	2,900
Colorado Mines	2,109
Colorado University	2,300
Cornell	6,000
University of Denver (tuition, incidentals only)	1,200
Harvard	5,200
Kansas	2,800
Michigan	2,600
New Mexico	2,800
Notre Dame	3,300
Stanford	4,800
Tulane	4,000
Wyoming	1,600
Yale	6,000

Tops on the list was $6,000, or an average of $1,500 a year; while a student who boarded at home could attend DU for a mere $300 annually. And the moral pointed out to parents of 1938 was that Junior's education, should he choose DU, could be financed by putting $8.60 a month for 10 years in a savings account paying the "current rate of 3 per cent interest, compounded semi-annually."

In that 10-year period, alas, came World War II and swept those beautiful estimates away with it.

Transit Department Bill Could Be Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a significant editorial appeared in the July 21, 1966, issue of the Winnetka Talk, a popular weekly newspaper published in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois. The editorial contains constructive comments on the proposed new Department of Transportation—including a recommendation by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] who represents the 13th District—that the new Department should include an office of aircraft noise suppression—and should have jurisdiction over urban mass transit.

The Winnetka Talk is part of the Hollister newspaper chain, which also publishes weekly newspapers that circulate in Illinois' 12th District which I have the privilege to represent.

I commend the president, Richard L. Hollister, and publisher, David A. Rose, on this meaningful editorial. I also compliment my colleague, DONALD RUMSFELD, for his many contributions to the measure to establish a Department of Transportation that will soon come to the House floor.

The editorial follows:

TRANSIT DEPARTMENT BILL COULD BE BETTER

Barring last-minute opposition, Congress soon will approve creation of a federal department of transportation to deal with the nation's increasingly complex transit problem.

The new department would in no way usurp local authority or interfere with private ownership of facilities. Instead it would permit the federal government to coordinate transportation policy.

The need for co-ordination is obvious. The government's promotion and regulation of transportation now is conducted piecemeal, with each mode of transportation handled by a different agency. Some are autonomous, others are appendages of large, multioriented departments. Duties and responsibilities affecting a single form of transportation often are divided among a number of agencies.

For example, five federal agencies deal with water transportation—the Maritime Administration, the Maritime Commission, the Coast Guard, the Bureau of Customs, the Corps of Engineers, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Four deal with aviation—the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Aviation Agency, Housing and Urban Development (aircraft noise), and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The Department of Commerce is involved with high-speed rail transportation and some aspects of automobile safety.

Yet the Interstate Commerce Commission has authority over railroads, motor carriers, pipelines, and certain inland water carriage duties.

But the obvious need for a unified federal department should not blind Congress to some deficiencies of the current bill.

In their minority report, for example, Republicans point out that urban mass transit would not come under the new department's jurisdiction. Administration sponsors leave this responsibility with the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs.

To omit today's most pressing transportation problem from the jurisdiction of the new department seems extremely shortsighted. The omission would perpetuate the very splintering of transportation responsibility that the bill aims to correct.

Cong. DONALD RUMSFELD (R–13th) also is pressing for inclusion of an office of aircraft noise suppression. We agree with the Glenview legislator that the new transportation department should assume responsibility for dealing with this problem of growing concern to suburbanites.

The bill has another serious flaw. It exempts the federal government from meeting the standards to be set up by the new department. The government is the largest single user of transportation services and facilities, and its behavior could set an example for industry.

We favor passage of the bill to create the transportation department, but it will be a better bill if the aforementioned deficiencies are corrected.

Practical Steps Needed to Better Negroes' Lot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the recent wave of racial unrest and violence which has erupted in one after another of America's great cities is cause for concern for all thinking Americans.

I have heard many different remedies proposed to solve the social and economic ills which we have allowed to fester for far too long in one shameful ghetto after another.

Today, we sit on social dynamite. Nobody knows which city may be next. We need action now to eradicate the malignant sores which include overcrowding in housing, lack of adequate job skills and job opportunities, rat infestation, poor sanitation, and a host of other evils.

The Johnson administration's war on poverty has already had a significant impact upon many of these urban ghettos. But not nearly enough. In these areas, the war on poverty, and particularly the Neighborhood Youth Corps, have brought hope where there had been none. They have brought job skills and opportunities where before there was only frustrated idleness. But, again, much more must be done.

Richard Wilson, writing in the Friday, July 22 edition of the Washington Evening Star, hit the nail right on the head in a brilliant article entitled "Practical Steps Needed To Better Negroes' Lot." I hope all Members of the Congress will take the time to read it. Mr. Wilson has grasped the true meaning to the riots and violence and has pointed our steps in the right direction toward eventual solution to the problem of an intolerable slum existence which saps the vitality and weakens the moral position of this country at home and abroad.

PRACTICAL STEPS NEEDED TO BETTER NEGROES' LOT

(By Richard Wilson)

As was foreseen earlier this year Negro rioting has again broken out in some cities. The common characteristic of these disorders is that they are confined to the areas in which Negroes are concentrated.

Casualties, for the most part, are Negro participants, bystanders, and police who are trying to control the disorders. Negroes have not yet moved out of the ghettoes to "get whitey."

Much hand-wringing and alarmist generalization attends these disorders but very little attention is given to those aspects of the problem for which there are remedies.

That is what the rioting again brings into such tragic focus. Nothing meaningful, or not very much, is being done to improve the housing and environment in which Negroes now live, and will live for many years. Nor is enough being done to correct the extraordinarily high rate of unemployment among Negroes.

Theorists talk of abolishing the Negro ghettoes and discuss broad concepts of social equality and a dream world of universal inter-mixture and brotherhood. We cannot wait tht long. Or, theorists discuss the philosophical differences between non-violence and "black power," and the rise of violence-prone black racist groups who comprise only a small fraction of the Negro population.

But they drag their feet in pursuit of measures for improving the environment in which Negroes live now—not 20 or 30 years from now but today, not in some intermixed community of tomorrow but in the ghettoes that will continue to exist for many years.

Recent rioting in Omaha, Neb. is a case in point. Three years ago Negroes demonstrated for more jobs. Civic-minded groups drew up articulated plans to train Negroes for jobs they could fill. The outlook was good. After the recent rioting, a check with those who had drawn up the plans of three years ago revealed that virtually nothing had been done to execute them.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY can perhaps be forgiven for the imprudence of his recent remarks that if he had to live as so many Negroes live "with rats nibbling on my children's toes" he might "lead a mighty good revolt himself." The vice president is sometimes given to overstatement when he is exasperated, and it is clear that he is exasperated over the lack of progress in getting on with specific actions that can be taken to relieve the intolerability of life in the slums.

Some of these actions are so very simple—portable swimming pools, lighted playgrounds, transportation, entertainment centers for example. Other actions will require extensive planning and massive expenditures of federal and local funds.

A quick look at the Watts area in Los Angeles, with its unsatisfactory but relatively tolerable living conditions, causes one to wonder what could happen in the inexpressibly worse areas of New York, Washington and Chicago. Life in some of these areas is simply intolerable, the very ragged edge of existence.

These conditions make the current debate in Congress on open housing guarantees seem as if on another planet. Only a small percentage of Negroes have the resources to escape from the slums into better residential neighborhoods. With or without the federal open housing guarantee, they will live in slums that are growing worse and bigger by the hour.

What was true after the Watts rioting in Los Angeles a year ago is even more true today. A law library of statutes guaranteeing the right to vote, equal education, equal employment opportunity and access to all public places won't remove the rotten hearts of our cities. The true problems in the slums lie less in constitutional guarantees and moralistic principles than in improved living conditions.

The festering centers in the cities that breed crime, degradation and disorder threaten the safety and welfare of the whole community. Prompt action is imperative. This means massive programs for improved education and keeping Negro children in school whether integrated or non-integrated, massive efforts to restore the stability of Negro family life. Most of all, and immediately, it means physical improvement of the Negro areas, relief from overcrowing, poor sanitation, rat infestation, frightful housing. It means beautification and cleaning up.

It means getting on with the correction of specific and visible evils and less preoccupation with the sociological and psychological mysteries of the white-colored relationship that our great grandchildren will still be discussing.

How Has Communist China Planned Use of Its Human Resources?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, Dr. Yuan Li-Wu, who is director of program on regional control possibilities in the Far East of the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, delivered an address before the Commonwealth Club of California on the subject "How Has Communist China Planned Use of Its Human Resources?" His address, as reported in the Commonwealth, follows:

"RED CHINESE ECONOMY 10 YEARS BEHIND, DUE TO CONSISTENT OVERSIGHTS," SAYS U.S.F. SCHOLAR

(From address by Dr. Yuan Li-Wu, director of program on regional control possibilities in Far East, Hoover Institution, Stanford University)

We've been told Communist China is "shrouded in mystery." Indeed there is a great deal we don't know—always some missing information. There's also a great deal we do know.

My subject: How has Communist China planned use of its human resources? How does its development compare to that of Taiwan?

There is a problem of employing personnel and the relationship of agriculture to development in general.

Prior to World War II we always thought of "the availability of capital,"—"How much capital was necessary for required development?"

Later, that attention shifted to available resources: how could they be applied to effective use? Emphasis still remained on short-term technical assistance.

The need to coordinate training and education with employment and economic growth is important, because an abundance of unemployed and frustrated intellectuals is the stuff revolutions are made of!

Let us consider the manner in which China's R&D (research and development) policy has been pursued in the agricultural sector.

Systematic application of R&D did not take place until 1957. Therefore, eight years had elapsed before attention was given to the problem of R&D in agriculture—in spite of the fact that Communist China is primarily agricultural. And this is in direct contrast with the R&D effort in industry—for an agricultural nation.

Efforts were then concentrated in crop selection and cross-breeding of crops. The research areas selected and neglected is closely related to the number of available experts. Many agricultural experts had fled the mainland for Taiwan. On the mainland these resulting gaps in knowledge were not filled because of a failure to recognize them.

To the extent that new corp varieties were developed, they were not spread on a large scale, due to haste. New crops remained vulnerable to diseases and, in some cases, some yields even fell.

What modernizing of agriculture has been attempted hasn't been particularly effective because of the damage done during "the Great Leap Forward."

And it remains a question whether the "private plot" will be allowed to continue.

On the basis of above observations, what can be the result? Agricultural production has lagged way behind. At the same time Communist China's population has increased by at least 15% since 1949.

Agricultural production depends upon unskilled labor on a mass basis.

There have been several unavoidable factors: a time-lag as to (a) training and (b) intelligent adaptation to local conditions.

In contrast to the experience of Communist China, Taiwan has had a phenomenal growth of agriculture—for three basic reasons: First, an influx of Research and Development personnel from the Mainland, which provided a large pool of talent; secondly, there has been successful communication between scientists, technicians, and the farmer; and third, there has been greater production and greater derivative income, from voluntarily following advice of the technicians.

The use of human resources in the two Chinas is different. In Communist China people are used in agriculture while the emphasis is going toward industry on Taiwan.

What is the future of agricultural research in the long run? In Communist China there has been an increase in institutes of industrial design. For Taiwan there are exchange and purchase programs including the U.S. There appears to be an increasing need for specific employment opportunities.

The application of Research and Development to production and basic research, requires further emphasis:

Perhaps a human resources program should be made a part of any effort to terminate any program of foreign aid.

ANSWER FROM WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question (R. L. ASQUITH). What can (Red) China do to control her population?

Answer. Always been doing something. For ten years they've had active birth control program. The campaign is played down from time to time but still going on. Also they have legalized abortions and discouraged early marriage.

Question (ROBERT R. LEE). Mao an international Communist or Chinese Nationalist?

Answer. Mao's a Communist and shares aims of international Communism. At same time operates within a Chinese environment; so the vehicle used is the Chinese state. He will use the Chinese state and nation to further his interests. Can't divorce one from the other. His use of nationalism is a strategy—not a goal.

Question (RALPH LAIRD). How far would Chinese economy have progressed under Kuomintang?

Answer. China was on verge of economic "take-off" in latter 1930's. By 1937 was on verge of sustained growth. Japanese war was an "interlude." Growth between 1952–1957 was resumption of a long-term trend. Chinese growth pattern is different. Hard to tell where it could go if Communists were not there. There was a spurt of growth 1958–60, then sharp depression and recovery. Growth was retarded by at least ten years.

Question. (1) Are farm communes common in Red China? (2) Has commune system produced more food than family farms?

Answer. (1) Introduced in 1958. In 1959 a sharp decline in food production; 1960–61 saw a severe food shortage. Communes reorganized in 1961. Production/distribution functions lowered from commune to "team" level. In 1961 private plots also restored. This shift, since 1961, has accounted for what little recovery there's been: not enough to offset damage by "Great Leap Forward." Present grain production has barely reached 1957 level—a ten-year production lag.

Question (L. R. GARDNER). Will Red China and Japan team together more closely for economic reasons?

Answer. Communist China always dangled trade as a bait to Japanese exporters. Possibility of vast expansion of trade remote, unless Japan willing to extend substantial long-term credit. Another factor—to what extent China operates on a pragmatic basis without trade as a wedge—would influence volume of trade.

Question (JOHN A. ROWE, Jr.). Chinese experts going to Taiwan—are they government employees?

Answer. Movement of specialists and researchers was in late 1940's. Went to Taiwan especially because of U.S./Chinese agricultural cooperation programs.

Question (ROY P. NEWELL). Will Communist China ever kow-tow to non-Communists?

Answer. Most unlikely.

Question (PAUL HEYNEMAN). Comment on position of overseas Chinese as to loyalty toward mainland?

Answer. Since World War II, quite a change in attitudes toward host countries. Greater movement toward local integration. Will tend to go to winning side.

Question (D. S. RIGGS). Is Red China, in reality, capable of processing her natural resources enough to make her massive manpower effective militarily?

Answer. Depends on nature of warfare. If guerrilla warfare, there would be little problem in supporting "wars of national liberation." If conventional warfare on a large scale—could be sustained only for short periods. In order to do so they'd have to modernize, which they could not do without Russian aid. If nuclear—there is a capability. While such development would affect economic growth, it wouldn't be immediately apparent. There'd be no serious constraint if skilled manpower available.

Question. How full and accurate information out of Red China?

Answer. Can get considerable information on an open basis. There are gaps but we do have great deal. All there for interested parties. Doubt we could get much more by sending correspondents to China.

Legislation To Assist Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN W. DYAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, those Members of the Congress who have been concerned over the problems of our American Indians will be interested in the editorial which recently appeared in the San Bernardino Daily Sun:

Legislation To Assist Indians

The American Indian, who seemingly has been bypassed in this age of technology, stands to benefit in new Department of Interior legislation being prepared on Indians. In fact, the new legislation is deemed the most important in 30 years.

The legislation's key provision, if approved, will alter the tribal trusteeship laws. The Department of Interior desires the tribes to be able to enter into partnership with private firms in utilizing natural resources on tribal land. Instead of leasing the land, as has been past practice, the tribes would mortgage it for industrial development. The Indians, in the process, would be trained to participate in management and be employed on jobs created by the industry.

There is, however, considerable convincing to be done before such legislation runs the congressional gantlet. Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall must convince Congress to allow the mortgages and private industry to take part in the development. Robert LaF. Bennett, new Indian Bureau commissioner, must persuade the Indian tribes that their risk will be no greater than an average citizen would take in mortgaging his home. Of the two, Bennett's assignment will be the most difficult.

Regardless of the new legislation's outcome, it is good news to learn that the American Indians' miserable plight at last is coming to the fore. This nation has poured billions of dollars into the foreign-aid trough supposedly to assist struggling countries to resist international communism.

Little has been done to improve the economic and social lot of the American Indian who indeed was the real victim in the birth and development of the United States. In our opinion, the remaining Indian tribes deserve a fair share of the political and economic rights which belong to all citizens in this constitutional government.

Honolulu Star-Bulletin Editorial: Communists Are on Trial, Too, in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, if we are to make a realistic approach to the situation in Vietnam, we must realize that communism too is on trial in Vietnam, not democracy alone. This thought-provoking suggestion is made in an editorial of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of July 20, 1966. In the hope that this editorial will stimulate thinking toward seeking new approaches to a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

They Are on Trial, Too

In almost every public discussion of our Viet Nam policy, the point is made that we are, in effect, on trial before the world. That is, we have made commitments; if we walk out on them, what ally of the future will depend on us, who will trust us?

It is a good point, and one not to be disregarded. It should not be overriding, preserved at the cost of all else. But whether on the score of national honor or sheer practicality it must always be considered.

The trouble is that hardly any of those who make the point ever bother to turn the coin. If they would they would see that our adversaries are bound to the struggle in Viet Nam in the same manner that we are, and probably to an even greater degree.

Communism is a relatively new concept in the world. Next year will be only the 50th anniversary of the Russian revolution. In another 11 years—in 1976—American democracy will be 200 years old.

The idea of a free society, and the free enterprise system that has developed from it, is in a much stronger position for maneuver than is fledgling communism. We could cash in our chips and walk out of Viet Nam tomorrow and it would not destroy us. We do not choose to do so, but we do have a choice of alternatives.

The Communists haven't such a choice, seen from their point of view. Their experiment is too young, and it has lost too much ground recently, to admit another defeat in Viet Nam. Even the Russians, who would like to suspend temporal adventures and bank on a future in Space, will not stand by and see North Viet Nam defeated. There is too much at stake.

Earlier this week the Russians stepped down hard on an attempt by Prime Minister Harold Wilson of Great Britain to open an avenue to a negotiated peace. The Russians told Wilson in advance his visit would be useless, and confirmed this when he arrived in Moscow.

They supported completely Hanoi's conditions for negotiation, the first of which is removal of all American forces from South Viet Nam. This condition is, of course, unacceptable to us; but the Russians knew it was unacceptable when they endorsed it.

We ought not to deceive ourselves either as to (1) the willingness of the Communists to fight in Viet Nam or (2) the pressures which compel them to fight. We tell ourselves that we are on trial in Viet Nam. They tell themselves the same thing, and, indeed, they are.

The Redwoods: A Call for Preservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, every day that goes by sees the number of redwoods that could be preserved in a national park still further reduced.

As the Izaak Walton League of America pointed out in a resolution adopted at their 49th annual convention earlier this month:

> It is in the public interest that a fully representative stand of these unique forests be protected and perpetuated.

But the Izaak Walton League goes on to make the very important point that—

> Such an objective will not much longer be possible at the rate of cutting of the virgin stands.

Mr. Speaker, time is not on our side in this fight to establish a Redwood National Park that will be worthy of its name. We must move quickly and decisively if this unique national resource is to be enjoyed, not only by future but by this present generation of Americans.

I include the timely resolution adopted by the Izaak Walton League for my colleagues' consideration:

Redwood National Park

Whereas the virgin stands of Sequoia sempervirens (coast redwoods) represent a natural heritage of national and world significance worthy of attention and concern by all Americans; and,

Whereas consumptive uses have reduced virgin stands of redwoods from an original range in California of some 2,000,000 acres to a present day area of only 200,000 acres; and,

Whereas it is in the public interest that a fully representative stand of these unique forests be protected and perpetuated in such a way that ecological, esthetic and watershed qualities of a complete range example are included; and,

Whereas such an objective will not much longer be possible at the rate of cutting of the virgin stands; and,

Whereas an area of approximately 90,000 acres of the remaining virgin redwoods stands is proposed for establishment as a unit of the National Park System, including a continuous habitat representation from sea level to altitudes of some 2,000 feet; and,

Whereas measures to secure this valuable national objective are now before the United States Congress: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled this 2nd day of July, 1966 at Boston, Massachusetts, That it endorses the principles and purposes of HR 11723, by the Hon. Jeffery Cohelan, and urges establishment of a Redwoods National Park without further delay in accord with this and similar measures.

First Manassas Fought To Keep Power Out of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, July 23, the 105th anniversary of the First Battle of Manassas, the major opening engagement of the Civil War, was observed at the Manassas National Battlefield Park at Manassas, Va. The principal speaker for the occasion was the Honorable W. Carrington Thompson, member of the Virginia House of Delegates from Pittsylvania County and the city of Danville in my congressional district.

Mr. Thompson is a distinguished lawyer and a former assistant attorney general of Virginia, having served in the latter capacity during my term as Governor. He is widely known throughout the State as a capable legislator and as a citizen and public servant who keeps abreast of the times.

His speech at the Manassas Battlefield Park was extremely relevant to the issues confronting us today, and I should like to commend it to my colleagues. It is as follows:

The history of the battles of Manassas, on a creek called Bull Run, is too-well known to you ladies to be repeated here in great detail.

You will recall the circus-like atmosphere with which the morning of July 21, 1861, began. Congressmen and their ladies came from Washington in anticipation of a great Union victory. Negro servants sought vantage points from which their masters and mistresses could watch the carnage that was about to begin. Fine linen cloths were spread and picnic lunches unpacked. Several Congressmen even treated the by-standers to a few flowers of oratory. Oh, it was to be a grand day!

You will recall how the Federal tide washed round the Southern position on three sides; how Union general Irvin McDowell sent off a telegraph of victory to Washington.

You will recall that it was here, on these fields on that dusty, humid July day so many years ago that Confederate general B. E. Bee, mortally wounded, rode down the line of Southern troops, swung his hat to rally the men, and exclaimed, "Look, there stands Jackson like a stone wall," and fell dead.

Finally, you recall how General McDowell lost his head and sent in regiments all along the line in piecemeal, disjoined attacks, riding with them like a sergeant.

Let me read to you a few lines written by the late Fletcher Pratt, one of America's leading authorities on Civil War history, describing how July 21, 1861, was to end:

"[The Union troops] shattered against the stone wall; the confusion spread, and in the middle of it, down the road on to the new Union rear came the rest of Joe Johnston's troops at the run, headed by the Louisiana Tigers. Helplessly caught, the whole Federal army collapsed, men and officers threw down their arms and ran for their lives.

"McDowell tried to save the day with some of the sound regiments from his left wing, but they only caught the contagion. The trains, the artillery, the wounded and even two Congressmen were abandoned, and the mass of terror-haunted fugitives never stopped till they reached the Potomac River bridges."

The city of Washington dripped moisture and despair the next day. For the first time, the truth was brought home to the North that it faced a long ordeal.

Nor need I say much about the second battle of Manassas. Second Bull Run ended like the first—defeat for the Union forces.

So much for the history of the battles of first and second Manassas. The question I want to address myself to in the time I have remaining is *why were these battles fought in the first place—why the Civil War?*

Historybooks are replete with a variety of answers. Slavery, the great American Shame—industrial North versus agrarian South—a progressive, democratic North versus a conservative, aristocratic South—answers *ad infinitum*.

I do not question that all of these factors played some role—greater or lesser—in the ultimate decision that turned father against son, and brother against brother. It is a rare history book, however, that discusses in any detail what I believe to be one of the major causes of secession, and the bloody war to follow—the spectre of a unitary government with its seat of power in Washington.

We are all familiar with the balanced mechanism of the Constitution of 1787; the division of governmental authority between the States and the central government and the distribution of power within the federal establishment itself.

Those men who fought and died here at Bull Run were equally familiar with the document. Indeed, their fathers and grandfathers had gathered in Philadelphia and drafted the Constitution.

Under the compact, you remember, the States were assigned a vital role. They were to have equal representatives in the Senate; State electors were to choose a President—or, if that failed, the States themselves, voting as equals, were to choose a President.

Continuing, the final power of constitutional amendment was to rest in the States as States—not in a mere majority of the States but in not fewer than three-fourths of them.

Finally, the States wanted it known that all powers not delegated to the central government by the Constitution, nor prohibited by the Constitution to the States, were reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Those men who fought on these fields knew why the Constitution assigned such a vital role to the States. They recalled that their forebears had *feared* the excessive centralization of power, and had wanted to secure the advantages of political experiment that arise from a diversified control of political authority.

No doubt some of the men who died here remembered hearing their grandfathers discuss the Virginia Convention of 1788—the ratifying convention—and of the dangers that arise when a government of laws is corrupted by a government of men.

"I may be thought suspicious," Patrick Henry had cried, "but Sir, suspicion is a virtue, as long as its object is the preservation of the public good, and as long as it stays within proper bounds . . . guard with jealous attention the public *liberty!*

Thomas Jefferson was another who sounded this alarm in the Virginia Convention. Suspicious that too much authority would ultimately be concentrated in Federal hands, he had said "I owe I am not a friend to a very energetic government. It is always *oppressive.*"

The men who fought and died on these fields were fighting for the same beliefs that their fathers and grandfathers had fought for almost one hundred years earlier. "The first thing I have at heart is American *liberty,*" Henry had cried, "the second is American *union.*"

The first thing those men at Manassas had at heart was liberty—the second was union!

Did they died in vain?

Early last year, Mr. David Brinkley—of "good night Chet" fame—addressed a group of students at Ohio University. The following statement is of special interest: "The decline and fall of the 50 State governments will be completed within our lifetime. The movement of political power from State capitals to Washington, D.C. is inevitable and unstoppable *whether we like it or not.*"

I, for one, do not like Mr. Brinkley's prediction. Nor am I so pessimistic as to believe that this ever increasing trend towards centralism can not be stopped.

The question is how? How do we restore to the States that which is constitutionally theirs—while limiting the greed of the power-mad federal government.

I need not spell out in detail how the Federal government has usurped the powers of the States. I need not remind you that since the decision in *Brown vs. Board of Education*, handed down twelve short years ago, the Federal government has taken over the administration of public schools in the United States, an area formerly within the exclusive control of the States.

I shall not talk about how Christ has been excluded from the classroom by Supreme Court decree.

Nor about how Congress has abolished the power of a State to require that its residents meet certain minimal literacy requirements in order to vote.

Nor how State control of the administration of criminal law is currently being threatened by an ever-expanding system of federal control.

Nor how rights of property are in the process of being abolished.

You know these facts of life as well as I.

And yet, I for one have heard few protests—much less angry and outraged protests—from the citizens of our country over the increasing erosion of the powers of the States.

To be sure, several courageous Congressmen have introduced legislation to curb the Federal government, particularly in the reapportionment and school prayer areas. Unfortunately, it seems that the majority of the American people are unwilling to support these measures.

I believe that this lack of support is *not* because most Americans agree that a unitary government is the answer—instead, I think most of our fellow citizens are too lazy to bother. As Senator Goldwater said in 1960:

"We can be conquered by bombs or by subversion but we can also be conquered by neglect—by ignoring the Constitution and disregarding the principles of limited government. Our defenses against the accumulation of unlimited power in Washington are in poorer shape, I fear, than our defenses against the aggressive designs of Moscow."

One hundred years ago, these fields were red with the blood of men who feared the accumulation of unlimited power in Washington.

Is it too much to ask of our fellow citizens, today, that they must realize that the conduct of our public affairs *must* be entrusted to men who understand that their first duty as elected officials is to *divest* themselves of the power they have been given?

Peoria Journal Star Upholds the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Peoria Journal Star observes that President Johnson wants peace in Vietnam "almost any way he can get it."

The President has said and done many things toward that goal, the newspaper states editorially. He has used the carrot and stick in sizable quantities and is still trying both.

But the Journal Star adds pointedly that the only thing he will not do is abandon millions of Asians to the Communists. He will not surrender.

By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include this editorial from the Peoria, Ill., Journal Star of July 14, 1966:

L.B.J.: ANOTHER BID FOR PEACE

Lyndon Johnson's "alumni speech" this week merely demonstrates what has actually been the whole sequence of his actions in relation to Viet Nam. He wants peace almost any way he can get it.

He will bomb to get it. He has offered to buy it. He will fight. He will cooperate. He will deal with the North Vietnamese, the Chinese, the Russians, the British, Charles de Gaulle, or anybody else, anytime, any place. He has repeatedly offered not only "cooperation" and "co-existence" but huge bribes of economic aid to Asian communities.

He has used "the carrot and the stick," both in sizable quantities.

He is still trying both.

The only thing he will not do is abandon millions of Asians, from the Philippines to Thailand, to the tender mercies of the Reds. He will not surrender.

As should have been clear after the experiences of the past 20 years, we are again learning that cajoling is hardly an effective way to deal with these people.

The issue has never been clearer than in recent weeks.

The problem is to get the Communists interested in peace.

So long as they expect victory, they are not interested in negotiations.

We have done our best to convince them that victory is impossible—except that some of us have gone way out of our own way to try to convince them otherwise, thus sabotaging the peace effort.

It is hard to see the justification for the constant propaganda, based on emotions rather than every realistic pressure and the record, suggesting that Lyndon Johnson is "faking," that he doesn't want peace, and that this is just camouflage for his brutal, power designs.

We can understand that as internal Communist propaganda, but it doesn't make any sense in the United States where peace would be a political boon to the President, a boon to the U.S. economy, and a boon to the programs for government spending in a variety of "projects" close to the President's heart.

The only other basis for continued "peace" shouting would be a desire to surrender.

But surrender of Viet Nam would be like paying blackmail—the price and the demands would never stop.

It would be a desertion that would bring praise from many nations, and with the surface praise a complete collapse of any faith or trust or reliance on the U.S. anywhere in the world, again.

And without us, even the ranking Indians and French critics, privately admit, the free world would fall apart and succumb step by step to the threats presented by Communist regimes.

Eye for an Eye

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, on July 8, the Janesville Gazette, a prominent daily newspaper in the First District, published an editorial giving a well reasoned summary of the civil rights movement. They point out that legislation is only one step in effecting social change and the more difficult part is the acceptance of changes which occur. It is in this area, the editorial notes, that the threat of violence is most likely to occur.

The full text of the editorial follows:

EYE FOR AN EYE

Last year, delegates to the generally moderate and respected Congress of Racial Equality voted down a resolution proposing that its policy of nonviolence be revised. This year, at a Baltimore convention over the July 4 weekend, this new and potentially dangerous departure received favorable action.

The action is perhaps a straw in the wind in the development of Negro civil rights programs, and one which merits the censure of moderates of all races. Violence can lead to endless trouble, but it cannot solve problems, Negro or otherwise. It is noteworthy that the Rev. Martin Luther King, given the hint that CORE might abandon its nonviolence character, stayed away from the convention by way of protest.

The threat contained in the CORE resolution of course is not that of aggression, but of defense. Negroes, it declares, have the right of self-defense if subjected to violence or threat of violence. This is a common law right which scarcely needs to be formalized in a policy resolution. When it is thus given organization backing officially, it is bound to act as an invitation to hotheads. The threat of violence is easily perceived by any who are bent upon violence.

The situation is ready made for radicals and Communists who seize upon discontented groups as a means of creating disorder. The civil rights movement is one of those offering the most promise for the Red professionals, who doubtless are operating among Negroes as they are among white civil rights enthusiasts, especially students. The interest of the Reds, however, is anything but civil rights or rights of any kind. What they are looking for are the tools of revolution.

Impatience and discontent on the part of Negroes is well understood by their friends. Even though rather remarkable advances have been made in a short period of years, much remains to be done to achieve equality in a meaningful way.

With the pending civil rights act of 1966 now on its way through Congress, it is generally recognized that relief via legislation is reaching its practical limits. From here on, the effort must be directed increasingly toward cooperation and acceptance of change. Since it is easier to pass laws than create social change, the more delicate part of the operation is just ahead.

If Negroes in any substantial numbers respond to the call for violence on whatever pretext, this necessary process will be slowed if not stopped. The cultivation of public support in white communities is essential to success; since Negro population, concentrated in scattered geographical pockets, amounts to perhaps one-tenth of the white population, those who dream of a "war" and seizure of "black power" have a hopeless cause. The United States remains essentially a nation of whites, a majority of which needs to be convinced of the righteousness of Negro claims.

The appeal of the radicals, however, cannot be discounted, especially in the limited areas where Negro concentrations are greatest. It is in these same areas that the start which has been made toward Negro justice is least likely to be visible.

Responsible civil rights organizations now have a double task. They must carry on the work for which they were formed—that of promoting Negro status—while at the same time discouraging those who by unwise impulsive actions slow or even wreck the efforts which just now are beginning to make progress felt.

Mr. Helms, of CIA, Writes Letter to Editor of St. Louis Globe-Democrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I was astonished to read today of the letter to the editor of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, written by Mr. Richard Helms, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Only last week, Mr. Helms injected himself into the Senate ethics hearings.

Mr. Helms seems to be recently addicted to injecting himself into the center of public controversy and politically charged debate in a fashion which is wholly inconsistent with his role as Director of the top secret and highly sensitive Central Intelligence Agency.

The CIA needs a Director who finds no necessity for such personal public embroilment. To the contrary, an agency as uniquely sensitive as the CIA needs a Director with a highly developed sense of restraint and discretion, and a sophisticated and judicious awareness of the importance of the nonpolitical character of the CIA.

This country cannot tolerate our most secret and sensitive intelligence organization injecting itself into domestic politics. There is already deep concern among many thoughtful Members of both Houses of Congress as to the role of the CIA in our foreign policy.

The extraordinary lack of mature, balanced judgment which Mr. Helms has shown in recent weeks would be more than sufficient to have placed in serious jeopardy, the usefulness of any official serving at any level of a discrete and sensitive intelligence agency.

I urge that the proper committees of Congress make a thorough scrutiny of Mr. Helms recent conduct and determine his fitness to continue in this highly sensitive and demanding post.

Auto Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on the editorial page of this morning's Washington Post there appears an editorial entitled "Whither Auto Safety?" It is a good commentary on the version of the traffic safety bill recently reported out of the House Commerce Committee, and it explains the strengths and weaknesses of the bill. I commend it to all Members of the House and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

WHITHER AUTO SAFETY?

After considerable deliberation the House Commerce Committee has presented to the House an auto safety bill. There is reason for the pride Chairman HARLEY O. STAGGERS expressed at his committee's accomplishment. To the Senate-passed bill the committee added provisions that would include trucks and used cars. They would also establish an advisory council to consult with the Secretary of Commerce on safety standards. They would give the Secretary power to require disclosure of performance and technical data to purchasers of new cars.

A reading of the bill, however, leads one to doubt that it will sail through the House as easily as Mr. STAGGERS says it will. Although this is a complex piece of legislation, the importance of the bill—both to the Nation's motorists and as a precedent for future legislation—is such that when the bill comes to the floor members of the House must be aware of its weaknesses as well as its strengths.

First, and most important, the penalties and enforcement sections must be improved. If the public's concern for safer automobiles is to be reflected in the legislation, there must be workable provisions to enforce safety standards and to penalize those who violate them. The Government must be able to investigate and prosecute violators. The investigatory powers included in the Senate bill are absent in the House bill. There is a provision allowing the Secretary of Commerce to order manufacturers to notify owners of defects when they are discovered, but there is no penalty for not doing so. The Senate bill lets a manufacturer off the hook if violations were not known to exist. The House bill widens this escape route considerably.

A graphic illustration of the weakness of the House bill is contained in 117(b). It stipulates that anyone who violates a provision of auto safety laws now in effect before the new bill becomes law, shall be punished. This means a willful violator of the seat belt or brake fluid standards may be criminally punished now, but if he waits until the new bill is signed, he may not.

There are other defects in the bill. Its drafting causes ambiguities and confusion in some sections. Petty differences from the wording of the Senate may needlessly prolong a conference between the two Houses. By not providing the Secretary of Commerce with strong tools for enforcement, the Congress will prejudice vigorous enforcement and encourage timid administration.

If the auto safety bill that passes Congress is to contain substance under its shell of indignation, it must be strengthened on the House floor and in conference.

The President on Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor calls on all those whose frustrations have led them to acts of violence to take to heart President Johnson's advice that continued unruliness could imperil Negro progress.

In a thoughtful editorial on events of recent days, the Monitor expresses doubt that any President since Abraham Lincoln has shown as immediate and deep concern for advancement of the Negro as has President Johnson.

He understands the tensions and disillusionments which beset Negroes, the newspaper declares. But he is deeply troubled lest violence and rioting arouse counterreactions harmful to legitimate Negro demands and hopes.

At the same time, the newspaper insists, close attention should be paid to the President's demand that all lawfully constituted authorities themselves obey the laws of the land. Wherever it exists, the notion that there is one law for the white man and another for the black man must be corrected.

Everyone, white and black, must avoid throwing roadblocks in the path of progress, the newspaper insists.

In the belief my colleagues may want to read this entire editorial, I offer it now for printing in the RECORD.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 23, 1966]

THE PRESIDENT ON VIOLENCE

We doubt if any President of the United States since Abraham Lincoln has shown as immediate and deep concern for the progress of the Negro as has President Johnson. In the past two years he has pushed through legislation literally revolutionizing public and federal efforts on behalf of a higher social, political, and economic position for Negro Americans. Equally strong White House proposals are now before Congress.

It is thus impossible to look upon President Johnson as other than a man conscientiously committed to ensuring the Negro full and early enjoyment of all rights and opportunities. For this reason his advice that continued Negro violence could imperil Negro progress should be taken to heart by those whose frustrations have led them to acts of violence.

This does not mean that the President, as well as many other Americans, do not understand the tensions, the disappointments, and the disillusionment (with the slowness of that progress) which beset Negroes, particularly in the great Northern cities. It is rather that the President, again like many other Americans, is deeply concerned lest violence and rioting arouse counterreactions harmful to legitimate Negro demands and hopes.

We believe that President Johnson is right in his view that an overwhelming majority of white Americans wish to see equality and justice given their black fellow citizens.

Nor do we believe that the country will permit a loss of those great gains made in recent years. But we do believe that the President spoke wisely when he warned that it was crucial to the Negro cause not to jeopardize the present sympathy felt within that 90 percent of the American population which is white.

At the same time close attention should be paid to the President's demand that all lawfully constituted authorities obey the laws of the land carefully and strictly. A major Negro complaint, and one which has had much validity in many parts of the country, is that there is one law for the white man and another for the black and that hitherto the black man has been the victim rather than the perpetrator of violence. Wherever this is so, whether in the piney woods of the South or the cement canyons of the North, it must be corrected. Until it is, it will be that much harder to persuade Negroes to avoid violence.

This is a time of deep travail and wrenching readjustment in racial relations. It tests everyone's patience and wisdom. But progress is being made. Everyone, white and black, must avoid throwing roadblocks in its way.

The Growth of Tennessee Eastman Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, a company that has contributed greatly to the development of Tennessee and particularly to my district is the Tennessee Eastman Co., a division of Eastman Kodak Co.

I want to congratulate the officers and employees of the company on their success, and I am inserting an article from the Kingsport, Tenn., Times which outlines the company's continued growth in recent years.

EASTMAN GROWTH HERE NEARING 15,000 JOBS

Employment at Eastman-operated plants in Kingsport has passed 12,000 for the first time since World War II, when a company subsidiary employed as many as 6,850 in operation of Holston Ordnance Works, officials of Tennessee Eastman Company revealed today.

And temporary construction workers who may be largely replaced by production employes when current expansions are complete, bring the total number of persons working at Eastman enterprises to nearly 15,000.

Mid-year employment figures at Eastman showed that about 12,300 men and women now are employed in Kingsport operations of Tennessee Eastman Company and four Eastman Kodak subsidiaries in the area, according to Harry D. McNeeley, president.

The current employment figure includes about 2,200 working for Holston Defense Corporation, which operates Holston Army Ammunition Plant (formerly Holston Ordnance Works) for the United States Government. A World War II peak in employment was reached in 1944 and 1945 when employment at the ordnance works went over 6,000 and the combined total employment in Eastman operations in the area exceeded 13,000.

"The last three and one-half years—the period starting January 1, 1963—have seen the greatest increase in employment by Tennessee Eastman group of companies for any equal period of time since World War II," McNeeley said.

The Eastman president reported that Eastman expansion in the 1963–66 period has brought about the creation of about 1,500 new Kingsport area jobs in the manufacture and sale of chemicals, fibers and plastics manufactured and sold by the Tennessee Eastman group of companies.

The job gain is in addition to more than 1,100 new employees who have been added by Holston Defense Corporation because of production increases ordered by the Government at Holston Army Ammunition Plant. The Army Ammunition Plant manufactures explosive compositions used in U.S. military operations.

In addition to the substantial gains in employment for the manufacture and sale of Eastman products, there has been continuing employment during the last few years for hundreds of employes of construction contractors engaged in work on expansion and modernization of Eastman facilities, according to company officials.

Currently, nearly 2,000 persons are employed by contractors on construction and engineering work at Tennessee Eastman's plant, and another 500 to 600 are working on modernizing and activating facilities at Holston Army Ammunition Plant.

Inclusion of contractor employes brings the total current work force for Eastman in the Kingsport area to approximately 14,800 persons, figures show.

Tennessee Eastman will supply raw materials to the new plant of Carolina Eastman Company near Columbia, S.C., which is being built to produce 50 million pounds a year of Kodel Polyester fiber, with production scheduled to start in 1967.

Eastman Kodak Company's 1966 budget of $171,000,000 for additions, replacements and improvements, provided $94,000,000 for work being done at Tennessee Eastman, Carolina Eastman and Texas Eastman Company, another Eastman Kodak manufacturing division at Longview, Texas.

Ralph W. Emerson, staff director of the Tennessee Industrial Development Division, said that Eastman is the largest industrial employer in Tennessee, and added that the 2,600 new jobs created by increased operations of Eastman companies, including Holston Defense Corporation, constitute the greatest employment gain shown by any industrial organization in the state during the last 3½ years.

The top employer in the Tennessee Eastman group is Tennessee Eastman Company, a manufacturing division of Eastman Kodak Company. Second is Holston Defense Corporation, the Kodak subsidiary operating Holston Army Ammunition Plant. Other substantial employers in the group of companies are Eastman Chemical Products, Inc., a Kodak subsidiary which markets the products of Tennessee and Texas Eastman Companies; Bays Mountain Construction Company, which does some of Eastman's construction work; and Eastman Chemical Inter-American Limited, another sales organization headquartered at Kingsport which handles a portion of the company's export business.

The broad construction and modernization program under way at Eastman includes expansion of facilities for the production of Kodel polyester fiber to bring the Kingsport plant's capacity to 100 million pounds per year; facilities for increased production of dimethyl terephthalate, a chemical intermediate used in manufacture of polyester fiber, plastics, and polyester photographic film base made by Eastman Kodak; additional facilities for making polyester polymer, from which Kodel fiber is made; a large addition to power facilities now nearing completion; a new organic chemicals manufacturing plant which is to be completed this year; and new facilities for production of terephthalic acid and cylohexane-dimethanol, both of which are used in manufacture of Kodel fiber.

Lauds Meany Stand on Boycott of ILO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the continued complications the United States and the rest of the free world face in the form of the international Communist conspiracy, I deem it of special interest to insert into the Record a column which appeared in the July 2 Polish American by its columnist John Switalski on the recent action of the AFL–CIO boycotting the ILO at Geneva:

LAUDS MEANY STAND ON BOYCOTT OF ILO

(By John Switalski)

"The AFL–CIO is building walls instead of bridges to One World." This charge was made in a New York Times editorial condemning the action of the council of the American Federation-Congress of Industrial Organizations which voted 18 to 6 to boycott a meeting at Geneva of the International Labor Organization after that United Nations organization elected a Polish Communist as its current chairman.

The Chicago Daily News, in a lead editorial, "Meany's Unwise Boycott," on June 18 also deplored the action of AFL–CIO President George Meany in approving the boycott and criticizing United Auto Workers President Walter Reuther for opposing this anti-Communist stand. "If Meany's view prevailed," said the Daily News "there could be no United Nations at all for Americans would have to walk out of the General Assembly, Security Council, and other UN agencies every time it came a Communist nation's turn to preside. It is particularly ironic that the labor unions, who regard it as their mission to educate unionists everywhere to the ideal of democratic participation, should walk out of the ILO when the democratic process puts an accredited Communist member in the leadership chair."

This is specious argument. The AFL–CIO is a free labor organization within the United States, not an arm of the U.S. government. It therefor, does not have to sacrifice trade union and democratic principles to U.S. foreign policy. Or, in other words, to operate as government stooges as do the "labor union representatives" from the Communist countries.

The Daily News deplores that "American labor could not tolerate sitting in an international body headed by a Communist." It does not, however, explain why. By its boycott of a Communist chairman, the AFL–CIO continued its principled stand against so-called labor movements which are phony because they are not free but mere tools of totalitarian governments. This principled stand the AFL has taken since World War II and is one that Walter Reuther once subscribed to. Because of this stand, the AFL–CIO has been able to give sustenance to free labor movements around the world that have had to struggle for existence against terrorism of Communist-led unions liberally supplied by Moscow with money and trained "activists."

Reuther deplored the AFL–CIO council's action, saying that he was "deeply disturbed about the growing negative character of the AFL–CIO policy on the field of international affairs" and called it a "disservice to democracy."

One should ask Reuther when the Communist Bloc regimes ended the Cold War. Does the lack of a free trade movement in Poland suggest that Cold War is over? Does the incredible harassment of religious celebrations of Poland's Christian Millennium so indicate? Does Russia's aid to Communist aggression in South Vietnam so indicate?

As for the New York Times editorial, one might ask why at a time when the United States is sending its young men to fight Communist imperialism in Southeast Asia, it is the task of American trade union movement to abandon its "mission to educate unionists everywhere in the ideal of democratic participation" and how to build and maintain a free labor movement and instead embark on globalist goals which have nothing in common with trade union needs either here or in foreign countries.

Let us ask Reuther whether it was a "disservice to democracy" when, at a time when the American press including the New York Times was still ignoring the existence of the Soviet slave labor camps, the AFL—in 1948—published a map of the Soviet Union showing the locations of the dozens of slave labor camps in Russia and Siberia? Was it a "disservice to democracy" when the AFL denounced the notorious Soviet-inspired Stockholm Peace Pledge, which was signed by some of the same CIO union leaders who now back Reuther in his attack on "negativism in international affairs?"

In voting support of Meany, the AFL–CIO council stated that this was the most effective means of protesting against what Meany feels is a "rising Communist influence in the ILO." The American press has curiously ignored the struggle that has gone on since World War II for control of labor movements in both advanced Western industrial and "emerging" countries. Communist control of the ILO could well swing the balance of power of Soviet-directed labor unions throughout the world. This is the issue here and the only one. Not that the AFL–CIO spearhead the drive either for "One World" or "coexistence."

Internationalist Reuther would like to make the AFL–CIO an instrument to further these ends. Reuther's neutralism is much closer to "negativism in international affairs" than Meany's position, which appears to be a positive one that will be understood by genuine trade union leaders in Europe, Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceana. It will also please Polish workers who hear of it via Radio Free Europe.

Grand Canyon Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the Appendix of the Record the reply of Mr. Rich Johnson, executive director of the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission, to the allegations made in the letter of Mr. Dale Slocum, recently placed in the Record by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, John Saylor, concerning the effect that Hualapai and Marble Canyon Dams would have on the Grand Canyon:

ARIZONA INTERSTATE STREAM COMMISSION,
Phoenix, Ariz., July 25, 1966.

Hon. JOHN J. RHODES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RHODES: A letter from Dale Slocum opposing Bridge (Hualapai) and Marble Canyon Dams was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recently by Congressman John Saylor. Mr. Saylor attached significance to it because Mr. Slocum is a resident of Arizona and a former executive secretary of the Arizona Game Protective.

It is interesting to note that the AGPA enthusiastically endorses and is actively working for H.R. 4671, while its ex-secretary opposes it, and that his arguments are simply a repetition of the tired scare words devised by the Sierra Club's professional propagandists.

Mr. Slocum implies that Marble Canyon Dam will reduce the flow of the River below it to 1,000 second-feet. He ignores the fact that Glen Canyon Dam now filling upstream from the Marble Dam site already accomplishes that kind of flow management potential. The flow is now and always has been highly erratic by nature. In the future it will vary under control.

He also says that the reservoir behind Hualapai Dam will "inundate the entire inner gorge of the Grand Canyon National Monument." Then he admits that the inner gorge is nearly 3,000 feet deep. He does not explain how a dam 600 feet high located 53.7 miles below the western boundary of the National Monument can "inundate the entire inner gorge" which is by his own admission 3,000 feet deep in the Monument area.

Of course there are dissenters in Arizona. According to the Bible there were some dissenters in Heaven at one time. I understand there are some in Pennsylvania just now who are unhappy about losing their homes and land because of a dam and reservoir that are part of the Delaware Valley Project. Perhaps we should stir them up to write a few letters for insertion in the Record.

Yours,

Rich Johnson.

"Ethics From Sinai" Completed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Irving M. Bunim is the author of a renowned three volume work entitled "Ethics From Sinai."

These books are published by Philipp Feldheim, Inc., 96 East Broadway, New York City.

Volume I in the series and its author were described as follows:

> Blessed with an endless store of ancedotes and a gift for presenting the most difficult subject matter with humor and charm to make it sparkle with life, Irving M. Bunim gives us here the quintessence of his lectures on *Pirke Avoth,* which have delighted and inspired his listeners for the past forty years—including enrapt audiences at the annual conventions of the National Council of Young Israel and at its Institute of Jewish Studies.
>
> Though small in length, the Mishnah tractate *Avoth* has had a profound influence through the centuries on the Jewish people. Since the time of the Geonim a chapter is recited and studied each Saturday afternoon for part of the year. As part of the *siddur,* it has formed and molded the Jewish character in every age.
>
> Beginning with the words, "Moses received the Torah from Sinai," *Pirke Avoth* represents the distilled wisdom of ethics and morality that is indispensably part of the Oral Torah which originated at Sinai. Though seemingly simple, its teachings are permeated with a subtle profundity, yielding fresh meaning whenever it is studied anew.
>
> With his redoubtable gifts and rich background, Irving M. Bunim has produced here a live and meaningful commentary, cogently, vitally relevant for our time. Drawing on the great store of classical commentaries, he ranges far and wide through the wisdom of Talmud and Midrash, interweaving explanations with lively anecdotes and pointed illustrations from everyday life.
>
> "It has been my good fortune," writes the author in his preface, "to learn *mussar* in its finest sense from inspired masters and luminaries. . . . The present work is issued in the hope that it will bring this helpful *mussar,* this 'good doctrine,' to an ever widening readership . . . to convey some of our eternal verities and values that we have cherished and treasured ever since Sinai."
>
> THE AUTHOR
>
> Known and loved throughout the ranks of observant Jewry, Irving M. Bunim truly fits the Talmudic description, "Torah and greatness together" (*Gittin* 59a). Having received a sound religious education, he became (and remains) a thriving businessman, yet has managed to give a lifetime of devotion to Torah causes, the while continuing to study it. Ever an associate and confidant of great luminaries (particularly the sainted Rav Aaron Kotler, of blessed memory) he has made his reputation as a superb raconteur and speaker on behalf of Torah causes, invariably holding listeners enraptured. But it is as a lecturer *par excellence* on *Pirke Avoth* that he has found his forté, out of a lifetime of study, thought, and sagacious observation.

The occasion for my comments is the fact that volume 3, the concluding volume, has just been published.

With this third volume, covering chapters 5 and 6 of Pirke Avoth, Irving M. Bunium concludes his sparkling commentary—a commentary filled with warmth, wisdom, and wit that has already elicited evaluations like these:

> "His book is indeed a veritable fountain of spiritual knowledge and a source of inspiration for rabbis, *b'nei torah* and educated laymen, coming from the international spokesman for world Orthodox Jewry."—Rabbi Hersh M. Ginsberg, *Dean,* Rabbi Jacob Joseph School and Mesifta.
>
> "Irving Bunim brings all of his gifts into splendid play in his long-heralded and eagerly awaited commentary on *Pirké Avoth.*
>
> "The full measure of his personality, idealism and wisdom shines forth from each wonderful page of this volume—which will certainly be regarded as a "modern classic."—Dr. Joseph Kaminetsky, *National Director, Torah Umesorah.*
>
> "Of course, it measures up to my full expectations. It has the full Bunim verve, charm and insight and, in addition, is written in excellent English style. I know it will have a tremendous impact on the public and allow your commentaries to reach an ever wider circle of our fellow Jews."—Rabbi Norman Lamm, The Jewish Center, New York.
>
> "I had expected this volume to be a great book representing a novel approach. I shall simply say that it exceeded by far my keenest expectations. It befits a man of your stature and your depth.
>
> "May you continue to be a teacher of your people for many decades to come."—Dr. Samson R. Weiss, Executive Vice President, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.
>
> "The work can be warmly commended, especially to rabbis and teachers who wish to make *Perek* the subject of *shi'urim.* They will find here enough material to last a lifetime of summer afternoon talks. The work is replete with illustrative quotations from Talmud and Midrash and later rabbinic sources, and there is a wealth of anecdotes and moralistic tales of the great rabbis of more recent centuries. The book will be as well a rewarding investment for the preacher. Bunim is a skilled *darshan,* and one finds countless novel and suggestive homilies."—The Jewish Chronicle, London.
>
> "In a masterful manner he discusses the teachings contained in *Pirké Avoth,* in the light of Talmudic and Rabbinic interpretations, always with an eye to their applicability to present-day issues. *Ethics from Sinai* is eminently readable; its style captures the reader's interest; and well-chosen parable, anecdote or Rabbinic epigram ever so often throws a brilliant light on the subject discussed."—The Jewish Observer.
>
> "One can immediately detect the touch of the master as *mishnah* after *mishnah* springs to life and page after page is studded with genuine gems.
>
> "I am confident that this monumental work will be hailed by all as true classic which will stimulate and inspire our thinking for a long, long time to come."—Rabbi Joseph M. Baumol, Dean Mesivta of Crown Heights.

I commend this literary work to my colleagues.

School of the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record a most interesting article concerning the Army's School of the Americas, located in the Panama Canal Zone.

The article appeared in the San Diego Union and was written by Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, who is director of national security and foreign affairs for the Veterans of Foreign Wars. General Hittle's background qualifies him imminently to comment on the importance of this school to our relationships with Latin American countries.

I recommend that every Member of Congress read this article and bear in mind that these are the observations of a combat marine, who also served as legislative assistant to the Commandant of the Marine Corps and assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs.

General Hittle is highly respected by many Members of the Congress. We are privileged to know him and I know of no officer for whom I have a higher regard for his ability and competence.

His comments on the Army's School of the Americas are factual and also are most complimentary to the Department of the Army and those who have been operating this school, quietly and without fanfare, for many years:

[From the San Diego Union, July 16, 1966]

In Latin America: Unsung School Combating Reds

(By Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC, retired)

Washington.—As a nation we are doing a lot of things wrong in our protracted struggle against Communist aggression. These wrong things are sensational, and thus get lots of publicity.

Yet the United States is doing a lot of things that are right in bolstering the free world and strengthening our own defenses. Much of this goes on quietly and is unsung. Much is relatively unknown.

The Army's School of the Americas is an example of the right, and largely unnoted things we're doing.

With Andy Borg, national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I recently visited this school with its headquarters at Ft. Gulick in the Panama Canal Zone. It has become one of the most constructive influences in Latin America.

BEGAN MODESTLY

This School of the Americas began on a modest scale in 1949 with a primary mission of training technicians for the U.S. Army. Then, only a few military men from Latin American countries were students. The school, however, filled a need and it grew rapidly.

Many of the countries "south of the border" had neither the military know-how nor the financial resources to have such military educational facilities of their own.

The increasing numbers of students from Latin American countries soon resulted in big changes in the courses. By 1955 the changing emphasis of the instruction was reflected in the decision to conduct all courses in Spanish.

EIGHTEEN COURSES

Today, the School of the Americas conducts 18 courses. Instruction ranges from technical classes in communications, motor repair, and first aid to the command and general staff course for high ranking officers.

A major feature of the course is a trip to the United States for students. While here, they visit industrial centers, a medium-sized U.S. city where they discuss municipal problems with city officials. They also visit a typical Midwest farm and a major state university. A stay in Washington, D.C., and meetings with governmental officials usually wind up their tour. They return to their respective countries with a far better understanding of the character and power of the United States.

The U.S. Army School of the Americas has a heavy and growing impact on Latin America. Close to 18,000 students, officer and enlisted, have graduated from the school. Back in their own countries they carry the benefits of their training into almost every sector of national life.

In many Latin American countries, plagued by poverty and poor educational systems, the military is the only nationwide organization with the skills needed to start solving basic problems.

CIVIC ACTION

For instance, medication technicians return home to help with public sanitation and bring medical assistance to isolated villages. This emphasis on civic action training at the school also teaches how to use military equipment and skills to build bridges and roads, and civilian airstrips in isolated areas. Such things go far toward combating the enticements of communism in backward areas.

The Communist threat, intensified by the recent tricontinental conference in Havana, is no abstract theory in Latin America. Thus, a major emphasis is placed on instruction in counterinsurgency. This includes intelligence techniques and tactics to combat Red aggression.

The influence of the School of the Americas and its graduates is more than numerical. Today its graduates are moving up to top military and civilian governmental posts in their countries. It is a favorable trend that will increase with more graduates and the passage of time.

Flat on Our Backs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, current concern about the dangers of inflation is somewhat lacking in historical perspective. I, by no means, wish to belittle the present concern about inflation, but I do believe it essential that we view the subject with historical perspective.

As a recent article in Forbes magazine points out:

> The free enterprise system has come through crises a lot worse than the present one.

I submit for inclusion in the RECORD, the full text of that article:

THE SUMMER THE MARKET DIDN'T RALLY

Talk about trouble!

The President of the United States is deeply concerned about inflation. "We must do everything in our power to reduce inflationary pressures," he says, in urging Congress to hold down federal spending. Even though he counts heavily on trade union support, he asks labor to forego excessive wage increases. Several major strikes occur.

The Federal Reserve Board, even more worried about inflation, thinks the money supply should be further tightened.

Abroad, Britain is going through a serious economic crisis. The Chinese Communists are on a rampage. Relations between the U.S, and Russia, after a period of thaw, are getting frigid again.

The stock market, instead of putting on its traditional summer rally, is dropping alarmingly.

And yet business is good. People are clamoring for things to buy. Dividends are rising. Stock prices remain fairly high, historically speaking: 16 times earnings for the industrials, 21 times for utilities.

Why are we rehashing the month's news? We're not. The description is of the summer of 1946; the President, Harry S. Truman.

History never really repeats itself of course, so there are differences between 1966 and 1946. Our problem now is running a war that came in the midst of a boom; our problem then was converting from a war to a peace economy. Instead of being tight, money in 1946 was all too plentiful, because industry couldn't meet the pent-up demand for goods. Treasury bills yielded less than 1% (as compared with more than 5% today). Prime corporate bonds yielded 2.5%; high-grade municipals, 1.6%. Banks were happy to make loans at 2% or a bit more. In fact, so plentiful was the supply of money, the Federal Reserve Board genuinely feared that interest rates might drop lower.

There were other differences: Although the Dow-Jones index fell some 23% between May and October 1946, the impact wasn't nearly as great as the drop of some 15% since its February high.. For one thing, there were not as many investors then (less than 6 million as compared with more than 20 million today). For another, the DJI was at less than a quarter of its present level.

Granting all the differences, the striking thing is that the reactions then were exactly the same as the reactions now; a wringing of hands, a wailing of disaster. In June 1946, the New York Times quoted one sage as predicting that it would take ten years for the U.S. to get back to normal. "The world," he groaned, "is flat on its back."

Well, he was wrong. Interrupted only by the Korean War and a couple of relatively minor recessions, the U.S. economy and its securities markets have been climbing ever since. Most of the problems that agitated the world—the devastation of Europe, for example—have disappeared. They have been replaced by other problems, true, but for all that the world is far from "flat on its back."

The alleged deep thinkers simply underestimated the strength and resiliency of the U.S. free enterprise system, which not only solved the problem of converting from war to peace but, in the process, managed to rehabilitate Europe and to help the Europeans roll back the Communist tide. We think the parallel holds: New capacity is coming on stream, tight money is slowly taking its toll on spending and investing and putting a damper on inflation. We don't know whether there will be a late summer rally or what will happen in Vietnam, but we're darned sure that, before long, blue chips will have their day again; and there'll be a higher stock market and lower interest rates. And it won't take ten years. The free enterprise system has come through crises a lot worse than the present one.

Trade-With-Enemy Ban Should Not Be Weakened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a change in the agriculture appropriation bill adopted by the Senate on July 15 could hamper our war effort because it would weaken economic sanctions against North Vietnam. The change involves the trading-with-the-enemy amendment accepted by the House on April 26 by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 290 to 98.

Imposed as a limitation on funds for the food-for-peace program—Public Law 480—the House amendment stated:

> No funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to formulate or administer programs for the sale of agricultural commodities pursuant to Titles I and IV of Public Law 480, 83rd Congress, as amended, to any nation which sells or furnishes or which Permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to North Vietnam any equipment, materials or commodities, so long as North Vietnam is governed by a Communist regime.

The Senate Appropriations Committee decidedly weakened this provision by the addition of this crippling modification: "unless the President determines that the national interest requires otherwise." The committee in Senate report 1370, page 55, stated that the House provision as it stood would "encroach upon the authority that the committee believes that the President of the United States should have in the conduct of his responsibilities."

On the contrary, I believe it is more accurate to say that it is the Senate modification—not the original House version—that is an encroachment upon responsibilities. It is the Congress—not the Presidency—which is adversely affected.

The Senate alteration gives the President the discretion to waive the ban when he considers it in the national interest to do so. Congress has acquiesced far too long to Presidential pressure in giving the executive branch a lopsided monopoly in the control and direction of foreign relations.

The discretion the Senate would have the President exercise can easily be used in ways and to achieve ends neither envisioned nor necessarily condoned by Congress at the time the legislation is passed. The Tonkin Gulf resolution of 1964 is but one example of this. While the executive branch does have a broad role in many areas of foreign policy development, Congress has the duty and responsibility, as the representative of the people, to give specific direction to policy. A good example is the subject I bring before you today. The House of Representatives, as the body generally closer to the people and more attuned to their opinions than the Senate, must not hesitate to see that its decisions are respected.

The trading-with-the-enemy curb is not a cruel device to punish the poor and starving peoples of the world. Under it, food donations could continue no matter what commerce the recipient countries maintain with North Vietnam or any other country. This is an important point which must be understood. The amendment as adopted by the House does not apply to donations, it applies only to "concessional sales," that is, sales for "soft currencies" or long-term dollar sales at nominal interest rates. It would deny the advantage of these deals to any country that trades with North Vietnam. As such, it would indeed have an impact, but hardly, a cruel impact.

Indeed, the impact would be merciful. To the extent that it helps to shut off supplies of all kinds to Hanoi it mercifully shortens the conflict and improves the position of our men fighting in that jungle war.

Why should our taxpayers finance special cut rate deals to governments—some of which like Poland are Communist—which send supplies to those who are killing American soldiers in South Vietnam? A Polish ship, I might add, was damaged recently while handling cargo near Haiphong.

The House bill as it stands is clear and unequivocal. The Senate version altering the House bill seriously undermines the whole impact of the amendment by creating a loophole big enough to accommodate a lot of cargo. Let us be clear. Let us give effect to our words. Countries which benefit handsomely from Public Law 480 provisions should be prepared to choose between purchasing our farm surpluses at special terms—more attractive than U.S. firms can get—or trading with a nation with whom we are engaged in a bitter and bloody war. They should not be permitted to have the best of both worlds.

The Senate language lets the President define the national interest. The national interest is, admittedly, a concept that is not without some ambiguity, but we should create a legislative loophole which would permit a subordinate acting in the name of the President but perhaps without his knowledge to set aside a specific and reasonable definition of national interest made by the Congress.

Congress is just as capable of determining the national interest on this point as the President and far more so than some unknown fourth-layer assistant in the Executive Office Building.

A conference has not yet been arranged at which reconciliation of differences between the House and Senate versions will be attempted. It is my understanding that the Senate conferees have been appointed, but House conferees have not.

In insisting resolutely on the House version, House conferees, whoever they may be, will be true not only to their colleagues of both political parties but more importantly to all our armed forces in South Vietnam.

The Morse Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the machinists strike against five major airlines has been permitted to continue too long. It is time for action to be taken to halt this strike.

The following editorial comment from the Chicago Daily News of July 26, 1966, discusses the strike:

THE MORSE RESOLUTION

Congress has available to it a step between doing nothing about the airline strike and collectively outlawing strikes that seriously contravene the public interest. That is to adopt the resolution introduced by Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon. The Morse resolution would extend the Railway Labor Act to cover the five struck airlines for 180 days, in order to bring the mechanics back to work. It would also provide for a new special dispute board, either to settle the strike or return the issue to Congress.

What MORSE's proposal needs is the support of President Johnson. And we presume the President—who has seldom hesitated to put the squeeze on industry when he felt the public interest demanded it—is holding off because he doesn't want to ruffle labor's feathers if he can avoid it.

But the public interest is involved in this strike as surely as it was in the rail strike. In an economy that is geared to the jet age, the airlines carry more people between cities than do buses and trains combined, not to mention their vital mail and cargo missions.

The $7,000,000 a day in airline revenue losses are the merest beginning of the punishment imposed by the machinists' wrongheaded walkout. The whole tempo of the economy has been slowed to some extent, while industries connected with travel have taken an especially severe drubbing. Both American business and the traveling public have come to rely upon dependable air service as an integral part of the national transportation grid. An arbitrary shutdown like the present one indeed demands the prompt attention of both the President and the Congress.

Surely the President needs no greater excuse than the machinists union's contemptuous rejection of the recommendations of his own emergency fact-finding board. And surely if the matter seemed important enough to Mr. Johnson last January for him to propose such legislation, it has far greater urgency now.

It might be that the mere serious threat of such legislation would be enough to jar the union out of its intransigence. But the union is well aware that if Mr. Johnson withholds his personal support, or gives only perfunctory support, Congress will hardly pause in its busy schedule to give this matter top priority.

So it is up to Mr. Johnson to make his own position clear. And if that involves some alienation of union favor, that is no more than any President must risk in carrying out his responsibilities to all the people.

Pittsburgh Judge Speaks on Criminal Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Henry Ellenbogen, president judge, court of common pleas of Allegheny County, gave an enlightening address at a national symposium on science and criminal justice. Due to the alarming crime rate we see today, I am sure that my distinguished colleagues would find this address noteworthy, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

THE ADMINISTRATION AND SCHEDULING OF CRIMINAL COURT BUSINESS

(An address delivered by Hon. Henry Ellenbogen, president judge Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh, Pa., at a national symposium on science and criminal justice, Department of State Main Auditorium, Washington, D.C., June 23, 1966, sponsored by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, the President's Office of Science and Technology, the Department of Justice, in affiliation with the National Security Industrial Association)

It is a distinct pleasure to speak this morning at the National Symposium on Science and Criminal Justice. The sponsorship of this Symposium is most impressive. It connotes an alliance and joint deliberation of the Department of Justice and legal circles with science and industry. A joining of all forces is necessary if we are to stem the rising rate of crime.

CRIME IS THE NO. 1 DOMESTIC PROBLEM

Let me point out at the very beginning that, in my opinion, crime is today the number one domestic problem. Society, government, and science have so far failed in their efforts to cope with it and to effectively combat it.

Every one of the three divisions of government has a distinct and important part to play in dealing with crime and criminals. The Legislative division of government, State and Federal, lays down the rules and standards. It declares what constitutes a crime and determines the range of punishment.

The Courts determine whether the accused committed the crime charged, and, if found guilty, mete out the punishment.

The third division of government, the Executive, must perform three separate and distinct functions:

(1) It must arrest the offender;

(2) It must prosecute the offender; and,

(3) It must carry out the sentence imposed by the Courts, and rehabilitate the offender.

Broadly speaking, the Legislative and Judicial divisions of government have performed fairly well. They carried out their task with a fair measure of success.

It is the Executive branch of government, State and Federal, which has singularly failed in its part of the job.

EXECUTIVE FAILS IN REHABILITATION OF CRIMINALS

The Executive division of government has failed in the treatment and rehabilitation of criminal offenders.

The rehabilitation of criminals is the heart of the problem. Every experienced judge knows that most serious crimes are committed by repeaters.

The penal institutions have carried out their custodial functions, but they are a failure in the much more important field of the rehabilitation of criminal offenders sentenced to penal institutions.

The behavioral sciences too, have so far failed in devising really effective methods and treatments of rehabilitation.

It is important that we recognize these basic facts. If we can agree that government and science have failed in their respective responsibilities, we can then concentrate our efforts to find the remedies to the problems of rehabilitation.

I strongly suggest that we do so. I believe this Seminar, sponsored by such high authority, should concentrate on this question. I think the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice can perform no more urgent and important task than pointing to the failure of the Executive department in the rehabilitation of criminals as the prime reason for the increase in serious crime.

Of course every agency of government must work within the framework of the Constitution and the Bills of Rights, Federal and State.

Only a few days ago the United States Supreme Court re-defined some of these boundaries. In four cases, beginning with Miranda vs. Arizona, it outlawed the admission of confessions made by accused under police interrogation.

CERTAIN CONFESSIONS STILL ADMISSIBLE

I want to point out that there are many confessions made by accused persons while in police custody which are still clearly admissible. It is important for police officials and district attorneys to know that spontaneous declarations volunteered by suspected offenders at the time of arrest and *before interrogation* at the station house always have been and still are admissible in Court as declarations against interest. This is very important, and so I repeat: Spontaneous admissions of guilt, unconnected with police interrogation, have not been outlawed. They are and remain admissible at the trial of the case.

These spontaneous admissions by arrested persons are by no means rare. They occur frequently. When they do occur, the police officials should carefully make note of them and include them in their reports.

ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL COURTS IMPORTANT

I do not wish to be understood as saying that the administration of our Criminal Courts and the sentencing of criminal offenders by the judges do not play an important part in the problem of crime.

Our Criminal Courts must be so administered as to have available:

(1) Adequate physical facilities;

(2) An adequate number of judges;

(3) An adequate staff;

(4) Speedy scheduling of criminal trials; and,

(5) A uniform approach to the sentencing of criminal offenders.

All of these are inter-twined. For instance, a sufficient number of trials cannot be scheduled and carried through unless there is an adequate number of judges. Judges must have proper physical facilities in order to function with efficiency.

As to the matter of scheduling: I believe that quick trials mean better justice. When trials are held within a brief time after the finding of the indictment, the recollection of witnesses is better, and their availability is more certain. Even the defendant has a clearer, sharper, and more immediate reaction to his involvement in the crime. The less that is left to faulty memory, the more likely justice will be done.

Speedy trials act as a deterrent to crime. I doubt that justice can prevail when the court is called upon to rely upon the memory of a witness several years removed from the incident about which he is asked to testify.

Furthermore, there is more respect for the law when the law and its machinery works efficiently, smoothly, and, of course, justly.

There are several aspects to the problem of providing speedy justice. More judges may be needed, more public defenders, more prosecuting attorneys, and better physical facilities.

Another approach to the problem is in the manner of scheduling criminal trials. The scheduling of trials should preferably be in the hands of the court itself where it is free of pressure and the vicissitudes of changes in the staffs of a political office.

The scheduling of criminal trials is a complex matter. It must consider the seriousness of the crime, whether a jury trial is likely to be demanded, and the availability of counsel and witnesses.

Misdemeanors are more likely to be tried before a judge without a jury. They can be listed more quickly.

The reason is obvious. Only a certain number of jury trials can be scheduled in a given period, because they consume much more time than do non-jury cases.

The make-up of the daily calendar also depends upon the number of judges available, upon the availability of prosecuting attorneys, of defense attorneys, and, more recently, public defenders.

In every case there must be sufficient time for the prosecution and for the defense to prepare for trial.

In short, to have effective scheduling, those charged with the preparation of a trial list must consider a host of matters. The calendar clerk is not unlike a symphony conductor. He must weld all of these various factors together so that every case is brought to trial expeditiously. This is in the best interests of both the defendant and society as a whole.

The greatest factor in the breakdown of Criminal Court trial lists is the postponement of cases.

A trial list can be made into a shambles, and judges, lawyers, witnesses and juries can be left twiddling their thumbs if a court permits wholesale postponements of cases scheduled for trial.

Too frequently, defense attorneys or defendants will come into court with last minute excuses.

I am firmly convinced that judges should grant postponements only upon formal petition to the courts, and then only when the reason offered for seeking the postponement is an inescapable and valid excuse.

Permit me for a moment to discuss my own Courts, the Criminal Courts of Allegheny County. We in Pittsburgh know all about backlogs in criminal cases. At one time we had a sizeable backlog.

Today, however, I can report that our Criminal Court is current. We have a large Court, which disposes of nearly 9,000 cases a year, and yet we have no backlog, none whatever.

Our grand juries are convened every month of the year except July and August. Thus, if a case is filed early in the month, it will go to the grand jury during the same month. Cases filed in the middle and latter part of the month are sent to the grand jury convening the following month.

Cases in which indictments are returned are reached for trial in our Court within two months. Although we give precedence to those cases in which the defendants are in jail, all cases are reached within two months unless there are special circumstances.

A major reason for our current status is the fact that in recent years in more than 80 per cent of our criminal cases, jury trial is waived and the cases are heard by a judge without a jury. This shortens the trial time and greatly increases the number of cases we can dispose of.

There isn't a major Criminal Court in the country, including our own, which cannot improve its system of handling, processing, and scheduling of cases.

DATA PROCESSING IS HELPFUL

I hope that the day is not too far distant when all the major Criminal Courts in the United States will have installed data processing systems to help in the handling of criminal cases. In Pittsburgh we hope to install such a system in our Criminal Courts based upon our successful experience with data processing in our Civil Court.

The use of automation in the processing of criminal cases would make it more difficult for cases to be misplaced or lost. Data processing permits frequent and careful checking and rechecking of pending cases so that irregularities can be uncovered and rectified.

An important by-product of data processing is that analysis of backlogs or lists of pending cases will uncover trouble areas—such as the concentration of cases within certain law firms or in certain categories of crimes.

Data processing also will provide for the judges who must administer the affairs of the court accurate and quickly available information on how the court is operating. Too frequently now, the staffs of our courts are too busy with other details to provide other than the most rudimentary statistical information.

The United States Supreme Court has laid down new rules to protect the rights of the individual. Unquestionably, these rules have placed pressure upon every law enforcement officer and every court. The crime rate, for whatever reason or reasons, has increased. This, too, has placed additional burdens upon our police, upon prosecutors, and upon the courts.

We must not seek scapegoats. We who are concerned with the law and law enforcement must see that the law meets the challenge of the times.

Without law, man would be plunged back into the chaos from which he emerged at the beginning of civilization. Law, adequately enforced, is our only protection.

The first duty of organized society is the protection of the individual citizen, his liberty, and his property. We who are engaged in the daily administration of law and the courts must do our part to see that such protection is accorded to every citizen, regardless of his race, creed or station in life.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*	1200 S. Courthouse Rd., Arlington, Va.
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*	
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1202 Longworth House Office Bldg.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	1705 Longworth House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg*	914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*	
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Fogarty, John E., *R.I*	1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*	301 G St. SW.
Grider, George W., *Tenn*	119 7th St. SE.
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George, *Idaho*	
Hansen, John R., *Iowa*	800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	3424 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	4517 Wetherill Dr., Westmoreland Hills, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y*	The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
King, David S., *Utah*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*	
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	